DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 251 JC 020 454

AUTHOR	Kanu, Alusine M.
TITLE	Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness in Community College Settings.
PUB DATE	2000-03-28
NOTE	148p.; Doctor of Arts Project, George Mason University. Index is not available from ERIC.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; College Students; *Community Colleges; *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Research; Instructional Effectiveness; Research Methodology; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Role; Teachers; Teaching Models; Teaching Skills; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Maryland; Virginia

ABSTRACT

The author of this study used content analysis as the methodology by which to examine student evaluations of community college faculty. The study sought to answer three questions: (1) What is the nature of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness in the community colleges of Virginia and Maryland? (2) What is the nature of the student forms used to evaluate teaching effectiveness? and (3) To what extent do the questions on the teacher evaluation form reflect teaching effectiveness? The author chose eight evaluation forms from Virginia and Maryland community colleges. The report examines four criteria, suggested by Mannat, for determining teacher effectiveness: planning, technical skills, instructional skills, and classroom management. The author tested each question on the selected questionnaires against communicative criteria to determine validity and reliability about each question. The author also added supporting behaviors to the list of criteria, which included: identifying basic teaching behaviors of set and closure; organization; assessing learning outcomes; preparation; and planning instructional behavior with mean referenced objectives. Criteria for technical skills assessment were: motivating students; knowledge of subject matter; assessing prior knowledge; and using observation forms. The author also identifies criteria for instructional skills and classroom management. (Contains 102 references and 10 tables.) Appended are eight evaluation forms. (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 251

Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness In Community College Settings

By

Alusine M. Kanu

A Project
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
Of
George Mason University
In Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree
Of
Doctor of Arts
In Community College Education

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Kanu

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Committee:

Don M. Boileau — Director

Victoria N Salmon

Gustavo A Mellander — Program Director

Gustavo A Mellander — Director, Center for Community College Education

Date: March 28, 2000

Spring, 2000
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

JC 020 454

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness In Community College Settings

A project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Of Doctor of Arts In Community College Education at George Mason University.

By

Alusine M. Kanu
M.A.I.S.
George Mason University At Fairfax, 1987

Director: Don M. Boileau
Department of Communication

Spring 2000
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

Copyright 2000 Alusine M. Kanu
All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgements

Whatever is of value in this Doctor of Arts project is here because a long time ago, Dr. Anita Taylor invited me to teach introduction to Speech Communication in a personalized system of learning while I was still in graduate school at George Mason University in Fairfax, VA, launching me on a career as a professor in Communication.

A great many people, both in academia and in real life, taught me at least as much as I taught them. Dr. Don Boileau introduced me during his chairship to teaching professional speaking and interpersonal communication. Dr. Warren Decker taught me with stimulating conversations. Dr. Daniel Rainey has always been there as my advocate. Dr. Nader Chaaban has been my associate for many years. I also want to thank Dr. Gustav Mellander for providing opportunities to learn leadership and to become an opinion leader.

Last, but not least, I would also like to thank my wife, Geraldine Williams, and my two children, Hawantu and Daniel Kanu, for providing friendship and encouragement in my continuing journey to become a Doctor of Arts in Community College Education at George Mason University.

I am grateful to those who have made it possible for me to obtain my educational goals. Anyone who has traveled to different parts of the world knows the joys and frustrations of intercultural communication. I do literally eat, breathe, rest, and produce. I have also matured through the actions of inspiration of the Lord Almighty because He has led me this far. I have grown, aged, and changed through acquired experience; and someday I will cease to exist. My long-range goal is to open a community college in Sierra Leone.

Table of Contents

Page

Acknowledgements iii

List of Tables vii

List of Appendices viii

Chapter 1: Introduction: Why Teaching Effectiveness? 1

Introduction 1

Significance: Rationale for Study 3

Chapter 2: Review of Literature 10

Introduction 10

Types of Evaluation 10

Peer Evaluations 10

Student Evaluations 15

Criticism 24

Communication Evaluation 24

Improving Instructional Effectiveness 36

Accountability 38

Improvements 41

Measuring Learning 41

Self-Assessment by Teachers 46

Summary 53

Chapter 3: Methodology and Research Design 55

Introduction 55

Content Analysis 55

Research Design 57

Nature of Faculty Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness 58

Nature of Questions in Student Evaluation Forms 59

Extent to Which Teacher Evaluation Forms Analyze Teaching Effectiveness 59

Representative Sample 61

Developing A Measurement System 62

Planning 64

Planning Instructional Behavior 64

Set and Closure 64

Organization 65

Learning Outcomes 65

Technical Skills 65

Motivating Students 66

Knowledge of Subject Matter 66

Using Observation Forms 66

Instructional Skills 67
    Identifying Nonverbal Cues 67
    Communicating Ideas Effectively 67
    Explaining Concepts 68
Classroom Management 69
    Superior Personality 69
    Good Judgement and Reasoning 70
Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion 71
Criteria and Questions 71
Discussion 90
Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendations 94
Conclusion 94
Recommendations 97
    What Administrators Can Do 97
    The Role of the Dean 98
    The Role of the Departmental Chair 101
    Limitations 103
Future Research 104

List of Tables

Table Page

1. Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness 63
2. Responses to Student Evaluation Forms, Sorted by Competency 74
3. Catonsville Community College Student Evaluation 77
4. J. Sergeant Reynolds Community College Student Evaluation 79
5. Dabney S. Lancaster College Student Evaluation 81
6. Montgomery Community College Student Evaluation 82
7. Baltimore City Community College Student Evaluation 84
8. Chesapeake Community College Student Evaluation 85
9. Averett Community College Student Evaluation 86
10. Northern Virginia Community College Student Evaluation 89

List of Appendices

Page

Appendix A, Catonsville Community College Student Evaluation 121

Appendix B, J. Sergeant Reynolds Community College Student Evaluation 122

Appendix C, Dabney S. Lancaster Community College Student Evaluation 123

Appendix D, Montgomery Community College Student Evaluation 124

Appendix E, Baltimore City Community College Student Evaluation 125

Appendix F, Chesapeake Community College Student Evaluation 126

Appendix G, Averett Community College Student Evaluation 127

Appendix H, Northern Virginia Community College Student Evaluation 128

Abstract

EVALUATING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Alusine M. Kanu, M.A.I.S.

George Mason University, 2000

Dissertation Director: Dr. Don M. Boileau

This study presents relatively detailed accounts of teacher evaluation by students at eight community colleges in Virginia and Maryland. It is impossible to understand fully how teacher evaluation systems develop without knowing the broader context. Studying the development of teacher evaluation may help readers appreciate variations and assess the extent to which consensus exists regarding particular aspects of contemporary practice in teacher evaluations. The study started with a review of literature, methodology and research design, and results, followed by discussion and recommendations for future directions related to evaluating teaching effectiveness in the community college. In the classroom, most teachers face many different challenges that require patience, practice, and knowledge; hence, teaching is considered a vocation. No national, agreed-upon guidelines exist in the evaluation process of teachers. The performance of most teachers is as unique as the teachers themselves.

A summary of the topic of evaluating teaching effectiveness is essential. Basically this study provided answers to the research questions and discussions which described the intent and goals. The findings were used to derive implications for evaluation practices in community college settings. The first finding suggested that the problem with evaluations is that few issues in education are more complex than the evaluation of teachers and their teaching styles. The community college dean must encourage and develop college activities that reward teaching, as well as develop short-term and long-time strategies to assist faculty in improving teaching performance. This study also provides suggestions for administrators and department chairs to integrate communication and education in the development of teacher evaluation.

The second finding concerned the nature of questions in student evaluation forms. The validity and reliability of questions depend on whether the questions measure or identify something important in a learning environment. In this study, based on Mannat's criteria, the questions are valid and reliable.

The third finding concerned the extent to which teacher evaluation forms analyzed teaching effectiveness. One requirement of valid teacher evaluation is that multiple data be used for each teacher. The finding showed teacher evaluation forms in community colleges generally analyze teaching effectiveness. Implications of the study are that teachers need to make use of competencies such as those suggested by Mannat: (1) Planning, (2) Technical Skills, (3) Instructional Skills, and (4) Classroom Management.

CHAPTER 1

Why Teaching Effectiveness?

Introduction

One of the hardest things about teaching is evaluating it. How can one tell whether a teaching program is effective or not? How does one measure its degree of effectiveness? What is the relationship between how much students liked a class and how much they learned from it?

Every learning experience should be evaluated. Evaluation has the purpose of discovering whether learning took place. What happened as part of the learning program? Essentially, did the learner learn; and if so, what?

Evaluation is measured against the learning objectives determined and stated before the learning program began. Evaluation uses the actual learning situation as the approach to determining what happened. Evaluation is designed to improve the program which has been evaluated.

The topic of evaluating teaching effectiveness is designed for community college professionals or anyone interested in teaching and education who is or may be concerned about the following research questions:

1. What is the nature of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness in the community colleges of Maryland and Virginia?
2. What is the nature of the student forms used to evaluate teaching effectiveness?
3. To what extent do the questions on the teacher evaluation form reflect teaching effectiveness?

These school evaluations in Maryland and Virginia influence community colleges across the country because they are very similar.

This project is divided into an introduction and four chapters. Chapter 2 starts with a review of literature and consists of the rationale for study. It addresses the types of evaluation, which are peer and student evaluations, and offers a criticism based on accountability, communication evaluations, and improving instructional effectiveness. It then provides suggestions for improvement on issues that concern measuring learning and self assessment by teachers because they are essential to teaching and learning. The methodology and research design are discussed in Chapter 3. The discussion consists of content analysis, research design, and a detailed description of the research problem and solutions. Chapter 4 consists of findings and discussion. Chapter 5 consists of the conclusions with recommendations for administrators, deans, and department chairs or coordinators.

The researcher tried to highlight a representative sample of community colleges in Virginia and Maryland. The sources represent the diverse areas of communication and education with regard to evaluating teaching effectiveness.

Significance: Rationale for Study

This doctoral project represents independent and original research in the field of communication education in the topic of evaluating teaching effectiveness in community colleges. What inspired this project is that educators underestimate the severity of the problem of student evaluations as a significant measure of teaching performance. It has been my experience that despite significant ratings for the past 15 years, I have felt inadequately recognized or involved in educational institutions in which I have hoped to obtain a full-time teaching position in a career field where I have given my all. I am the product of a recognized university. I have exceptional talents in developing people skills; my classes are sought by many students because of ratings that reflect a high level of student satisfaction in developing life-long communication skills.

With the passage of time, I have learned the simple truth that society can work only if educators understand the role teachers play.

Educators cannot know the millions of other Americans who may have cultural perceptions and symbol systems unless they hear teachers' voices. They cannot know if teachers and educators share the same dreams and fears unless they hear teachers' stories. Educators cannot know what teachers want or how they feel unless they ask them.

American institutions should continue to provide opportunities to people of varied demographic backgrounds. In order to be effective, American community colleges must effectively cross utilize ideas, beliefs, and values.

This study has determined the relationship that exists among interpreted communication acts and utterances with regard to evaluating teaching in community colleges. It involves a critical examination with sufficient difficulty and scope. My aim, therefore, is to present with integrity and objectivity teaching evaluations in community colleges.

The results of this study are based on objective standards. Some principles of fairness or judgment have been applied. It has been my conclusion that one can develop and use fair procedures and fair standards. The outcome of such teacher evaluation by students creates helpful performance appraisals. In the classic situation of two people dividing a piece of cherry pie, if one gets to cut the pie, the other gets first choice of the pieces; the procedure guarantees fairness.

This research, which gives order and meaning to observed communication patterns, expresses the efforts of many people and the essence of my struggle to maintain a sense of self in relation to developing a career that is rewarding because of my acquired experience and expertise.

It is important to note that communication events which take place in an organization will contribute to its climate or prevailing mood. Those events can be characterized by "shifting winds" or turbulent times. Of course, the surroundings in which employees work and the salaries they receive play a role in determining overall climate. The quality of communication and peoples' reactions to that communication do more than anything else to create organizational climate--and determine whether it is positive or negative.

Perhaps this project's most unusual quality is that it is addressed to both students and faculty members. Certainly, it is aimed primarily at community college professionals who wish to assess, understand, or enhance teaching effectiveness and the nature of student evaluations. Learning cannot take place without a teacher or someone to act as a facilitator. Both teacher and learner are essential to the process. It is even possible, in some carefully designed situations, to reverse their roles for the benefit of both. Teaching and learning are a partnership transaction. It is hoped that the treatment of the subject encourages discussion between and among all who are involved with student evaluations and in enhancing learning.

Researchers have examined teacher personality traits, behaviors, attitudes, values, abilities, competencies, and many other characteristics as they influence teaching effectiveness to understand what makes good teaching. A host of measuring instruments have also been used: personality tests, attitudinal scales, observation instruments, rating scales, bipolar descriptors, and close-ended written statements. Borich (1986) argued, "The results of teaching, however, have been studied in terms of student achievement, adjustment, attitudes, socio-economic status, and creativity. Despite all these activities, few facts concerning teaching effectiveness have been established" (p. 14).

As community college teachers and professors struggle to improve the quality of their teaching, most of them view college teaching as becoming more stressful because of a variety of factors, including demographic changes, evolving roles and expectations of teachers, institutional demands on conducting research, ineffective reward systems, lack of resources and support from the college administrators (Nwagwu, 1998).

Others argue that today, colleges and universities are experiencing a new wave of changing student demographies that include students who have different economic, academic, social, and cultural backgrounds but--above all--students who are grossly under prepared to pursue college work. Such deficiencies in academic preparation make it extremely difficult for community college teachers to engage in instruction that promotes and encourages learning. This situation interacts with teacher evaluations because the results of student perceptions of teaching is a means of feedback as to whether learning occurs or not.

Because most students come to community colleges having an open door policy, which means admitting all students prepared or not--some with missing ideas, learning experiences, and linkages--the college professor becomes the missing piece of the puzzle who provides and develops strategies that will enable, support, and stabilize the student in his or her academic surroundings. According to Green, (1968) "Good teaching involves understanding, caring, and valuing behaviors—attributes not easily assessed by evaluation instruments" (p. 18).

At the community college level, the difficult and challenging task of improving teaching effectiveness lies partly with those who govern and control the institution. Deans and departmental chair persons (where that position exists), as college administrators, have a vested, controlling interest in providing and ensuring that effective teaching programs are in place in their various colleges and units.

Carpenter and Doig (1987) observed that teachers must be held accountable for the way they teach and for how interaction takes place in their various respective classrooms. The issue of improving teaching effectiveness in higher education continues to put much stress and demand on teachers in institutions where teaching is the focus. For most people, the image of the community college is that of a predominantly teaching environment.

"Empowering students," "empowering teachers," and developing teaching styles and methods compatible with the students' learning styles are buzz terms that have generated great attention in attempts to improve quality of learning. According to Stallings and Stipek (1986), "College teachers should try different approaches for different subjects," and "ultimately develop their own variations of what works for their students" (p. 24). Establishing quality and outcome in teacher and student performance is a dual responsibility of the community college teacher and the administrator. Thus the teaching practices are at the heart of the community college. So this study can influence the outcome of teaching and learning.

In the case of this study on evaluating teaching effectiveness in community colleges in Maryland and Virginia, the research problem reflects the reality `that few issues in education are more complex than the evaluation of teachers and the teaching styles of faculty members.

The specific objective of examining the ways in which teachers are evaluated holds the potential to help nearly every teaching faculty member. This research will focus on currently available approaches of evaluating teachers, by examining the strengths and shortcomings of questions, with particularly emphasizing student evaluations of teaching faculty members in community college settings.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Introduction

The review of literature in connection with the research topic of evaluation has two phases:

1. Finding a relevant starting point which, in this case, is looking at types of evaluation.
2. Expanding the search by offering criticisms and improvement on how we evaluate teaching effectiveness.

Peer Evaluations

This section of the literature review looks at peer evaluation and student evaluation and engages in a discussion of each. It offers criticism and provides suggestions for improvement and enhancement of teacher evaluations.

An important observation can be made with regard to perceived relations between evaluator and evaluatee. The role and significance of peer evaluation is discussed. Peer evaluations are useful procedures for evaluating teaching effectiveness in community colleges. According to

Benson (1994), six issues and problems are associated with peer evaluations. First of all, peers can assist in providing visibility for a proper priority of the purpose of the evaluations to ensure that such evaluations do not begin and end with the concept of blaming the instructor.

Peers are in a unique position to evaluate the professional competence of the instructor to teach the course. Third, peers can decide whether specific learning objectives identified for a course are appropriate in terms of the scope and sequence of other learning experiences to which students are being exposed, and whether the objectives relate to prior and subsequent learning experiences.

Furthermore, according to Benson (1994), peers can evaluate the appropriateness of the instructional materials used in relation to the identified purposes of the instruction, such as whether the materials are the most current available, whether they are accurate, and whether they adequately present differing points of view. Benson (1994) adds that peers can contribute to the evaluation of appropriateness and effectiveness of instructional methods through classroom observations, if the criteria used for the evaluation are valid in terms of the goals of the instruction and the context in which the instruction is taking place. Benson (1994) adds that peers can evaluate the instructor's willingness and ability to respond to the value judgments placed on the data collected to evaluate his or her teaching effectiveness. Peers are in a position to evaluate the educational contributions of the instructor committees or special project work.

With respect to peer evaluation, the question arises whether peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness should correlate with student evaluations in order to be considered valid. Many researchers have attempted to establish a positive relationship between peer and student evaluations in an attempt to document the validity of both. However, it is perhaps more important to recognize that both peers and students have a unique contribution to make to the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, and that it is not necessary for this information to correlate in all respects for either kind of evaluation to be valid and reliable. For example, peers can review the course content and instructional materials prepared (instructional input) and judge them to be satisfactory. In other words, they have judged the potential to perform as satisfactory. This process is a constant review.

Students, however, may report actual teaching performance as unsatisfactory, thus resulting in no positive correlation between student and peer evaluation. In this instance, both evaluations might be valid and reliable. Peers judge the *potential* to perform as satisfactory; whereas, students judge the *actual* performance as unsatisfactory. Peer evaluations are ways to identify levels of skill and development. They aid in classifying the significant goals and objectives and the process for determining the extent to which students are developing in those desired ways.

Bailey (1978), believes that teachers are fully capable of criticizing their own teaching performance. The present system indicates that such evaluations can hardly be accepted at face value. The author sees two alternatives--students and other observers. Since a large number of teachers reject student evaluations, the worth of these evaluations may be judged by setting them alongside the evaluations of qualified observers: other college teachers. Colleague evaluation will provide trustworthy criticism (an essential element of feedback), agreement as to teaching performance, and information for rewarding and punishing teachers Hodge (1996).

In response to recommendations from an accreditation visit regarding improvements in the use of research findings, Washington's Bellevue Community College developed an assessment inventory to give faculty and staff a more complete understanding of student outcomes and assessment efforts at the college. Following an executive summary and introduction, a chart summarizing assessment activities conducted by teachers to students between 1992 and 1997 is presented. This chart includes information on participating groups, results, and project contacts. Next, results are provided from a study of all 380 faculty regarding assessment activities and methods. This section indicates that only 33 faculty responded and lists individual and departmental activities, assessment methods, faculty attendance at workshops, assessment related resources, and professional development needs. The term "communication competence" refers to a person's knowledge of how to use verbal and non verbal language appropriately in a range of communication situations. When people work to develop communication competence, they are concerned with putting language to work in the following ways (Wood, 1977, p. 16):

1. Enlarging their repertoire of communications strategies
2. Selecting criteria for making choices from the repertoire
3. Evaluating the effectiveness of strategies used
4. Implementing the communication strategies chosen

The end results are that instructors will show students how to build concrete, informative, and persuasive speaking skills by linking public speaking to broader concerns of culture, ethics, and competency.

The transactive nature of relationships and interpersonal communication is another important element that takes place. The communications effect upon relationship development and maintenance are competencies that must be mastered by students. Students learn how to gain the interpersonal skills and knowledge required: (1) Get to know and trust each other, (2) Communicate with each other accurately and unambiguously, (3) Resolve conflicts and relationship problems constructively, and (4) encourage and appreciate diversity.

A broad integrative of group dynamics are other competencies which introduce students to the theory and research findings needed to understand how to make groups effective and to the skills required to apply that knowledge in practical situations. The knowledge and mastery of these skills create choices, opportunities, and successes for each individual.

Since there is less than 10 per cent return when programs are to be developed as indicated in Bellevue Community College, it is necessary to identify the needs and to show how the product can satisfy them. Even if the audience is not interested in, or is unsympathetic to an idea, there ought to be a way to link the proposals to the listeners' needs or values. Research has demonstrated that speakers have the best chance of persuading an audience when their arguments fall within their listeners' latitude of acceptance.

Student Evaluations

Student evaluation of teaching constitutes a recurring theme for debate within the tertiary education literature, particularly in relation to validity and reliability (Clouder, 1999). Clouder suggests that promoting an understanding of changing and developing epistemic assumptions of students should be an essential component of the explicit curriculum to the benefit of both students and teachers, and recommends the exploration of more qualitative approaches to student evaluation.

In the evaluation process, instructors anticipate the collation of evaluation forms at the end of a taught module, perhaps preparing for adverse comment regarding teaching. Instructors attempt to reassure ourselves that the term seemed to go reasonably well and that it would be impossible to please everyone but often feel hurt and disappointed by less than constructive criticism. Instructors may be simultaneously considered by students to be "an angel, a dud, or an adversary" (Perry, 1988, p. 10), a phenomenon which may prove difficult to reconcile for committed educators. What is vital is that instructors recognize that these ascribed multiple identities are a product of a student evaluation process influenced by a complex interaction of variables and agenda.

Student evaluation is based on satisfaction which has multiple influences, but is also dependent on and limited by the student's level of intellectual development at the time of evaluation of the learning experience. Differing "ways of knowing," based on epistemic assumptions (McKeachie, 1976, p. 8) within groups of students are likely to result in variations in evaluative capabilities which could be reflected in evaluations of teaching. Even though these materials are old, the theories, ideas and issues are still important today. McKeachie's contention is that evaluation on the basis of current practice, which treats all evaluations as of equal status, lacks validity and may be potentially damaging to those under scrutiny. With this difference among the evaluators, the best one can expect is satisfaction at the time based on multiple influences.

Although there has been a call to raise the esteem of teaching through quality assessment ratings. According to Utley (1997), teaching is currently assessed predominantly by students. According to Utley, the evaluation process may incorporate a collective gaining of views which usually take the form of a staff-student committee meeting, or alternatively, seeks to gain individual opinions by completion of a short survey lending itself to quantitative analysis.

Silver (1992) describes the student questionnaire as by far the most commonly used method of gaining feedback. Students offer their opinions about library resources, module timing and practical components of delivery, and the quality of teaching they have experienced. Analysis provides summary statistics in the form of mean scores and frequency distributions which may afford a means of ranking the performance of members of the staff. While the form-filling evaluation process probably becomes tedious for students, as recognized by the Higher Education Quality Council (1994, p. 21), who acknowledge the resulting danger of "questionnaire fatigue," the act of ticking boxes which combines anonymity with zero responsibility can by tyrannous for educators.

According to Husbands (1997), "Course-specific characteristics such as the number of students enrolled, the number of teachers involved, and the quality of course organization have been found to influence the teacher's ability to give students what they want," (p. 210). Sinclair (1994) suggests that perceived power relationships often give the impression that students and staff see each other as something other than people. This position, in the researcher's view, generates the idea that when students evaluate a learning experience, they often overlook or feel insulated from the human factor. Consequently, the teacher is critiqued with impunity, alongside inorganic elements of the course. What this position implies is that because of variations in learning styles and instructional techniques, without reference to life long learning, it would be difficult to find the ideal class room that fulfills everyone's expectations.

The stranglehold of student evaluations is highlighted in the suggestion that evaluations are an "insurance policy" to "create in the minds of teaching staff the apprehension that their performance is being assessed, and that their peers and superiors will be privy to the consequences of survey results" (Bonetti, 1994, p. 18). Because of the interest in results, which can be observable and sometimes even measurable, the emphasis should be on learning for performance. Evaluating teaching is important. It helps teachers improve the quality and effectiveness in the classroom.

Not surprisingly, there are common, possibly defensive, negative assumptions about the inability of students to make worthwhile, balanced judgments about course matters exist. The validity of student evaluations has been treated with some derision, giving rise to such notions as "good entertainers get good feedback" (Benson and Lewis, 1994, p. 16). Adding to these assumptions, research has shown student ratings of a teacher's personality and teaching competence to be significantly related (Jones, 1989).

Bonetti (1994, p. 18) focuses on the relative and extreme nature of student evaluations. He suggests that these evaluations can only be based on students' limited experience or observation of teachers, weighing relative performance, rather than absolute quality and that such evaluations often display the extremeness of thought and action characteristic of youth. We may question Bonetti's assumption with regard to the student population in the use of the word "youth"; but certainly when the best is seen as brilliant and the worst as dreadful, the range of evaluations could at least be partially explained by maturity or lack of it, although maturity is not merely a product of age (Yates, 1994).

Murray (1994) reviews the research on whether or not student evaluations can provide reliable and valid information on the quality of teaching, concludes that although results are complex and contradictory, both validity and reliability can be assumed to exist. Murray argues that student ratings have been found to show acceptable levels of intra-tester and inter-tester reliability, and also points to a moderate positive correlation between student ratings of teaching and objective measures of student achievement in support of validity claims, although he admits that this relationship is not perfect.

Jones (1989) points to good evidence of reliability in the presence of properly constructed evaluation systems but is more reticent in supporting the validity of student ratings of teaching. Although validity does appear to be contentious, general validity of student evaluations has some support (Miller, 1986). Adopting this standpoint, it may be argued that students are in the optimum position to assess teacher effectiveness, so long as there is an acknowledgement of inherent multiple biases. Unfortunately, quality audit mechanisms, with their tendency to search out negative evaluations and largely take positive evaluations for granted, frequently concentrate their efforts on the adverse evaluations of a very small number of students and bestow disproportionate weighting on these comments.

The power of student evaluations should, therefore, not be underestimated, even though students are often skeptical that their opinions will have any impact. Sharpe (1995) emphasizes that it has always been incumbent upon good teachers to sample student opinion, the original purpose of which was apparently purely formative, a model which persisted and was the most dominant certainly up to the early 1990s (Gregory, 1991). Subsequently, evaluations have come to be used at both formative and summative levels with some controversy, as they can constitute a source of information for institutional appraisal, they may be considered in support of recommendations for performance related pay and can even feed into tenure and promotion criteria (Hall and Fitzgerald, 1995).

At a formative level, Bennet *et al.* (1995) have found evidence to suggest that questionnaires provide feedback of a diagnostic nature, where teachers as individuals are left to remedy any problems identified. This process is perceived as valuable when carried out by staff personally. However, questions of validity and interpretation must again be raised. While some tolerance of invalidity may be acceptable at a formative level, effects on interpretation at a summative level could prove far reaching (Husbands and Fosh, 1993).

The basic distinction between formative and summative evaluations is that while formative evaluations are meant to influence or shape both the attitudes of teachers and students towards teaching, summative evaluations are aimed at interpretation. Since summative evaluations involves computation, they are more difficult than formative evaluations. Interpretation of student evaluations at all levels should take account of the cognitive development stage of the students concerned. In the absence of an appreciation of the context, analysis taken at face value can instigate condemnation at institutional levels or at the very least, disappointment at a personal level.

In order to conduct a thorough evaluation of faculty members during the evaluation process, one must ask, "Where are we now?" On the one hand, Meeth (1976, p.19) states that most evaluation of teaching has resulted in unfair and inconclusive distinctions among teachers without establishing reliable or valid relationships between what teachers do and what students learn in the classroom.

The process of evaluating teacher effectiveness can take many directions, from a classroom observation to a highly formal, computerized system in which faculty choose the areas in which they wish to be evaluated. Each process or method generates many problems. Indeed, Miller (1986) states that the process is more important than the product. This statement is more understandable when we consider that evaluation systems are produced by people and therefore reflect their strengths and weaknesses, hopes and fears. These systems can also arouse extreme feelings for or against. Many believe teaching is an art, not a science; and therefore, it cannot be measured accurately in the classroom.

We must realize, however, that instructor evaluation is still an extremely sensitive area and that there is more dissatisfaction with existing procedures and tools. In order to improve teaching, students must not only continue, but be encouraged to give their input. However, each institution and each department within the institution should carefully evaluate its objectives and its expectations of teachers and define its commitment to teaching effectiveness in light of promotions, salary increments and tenure. Although student ratings of instructors are vitally important in the evaluation process, these ratings cannot be taken at face value and must be interpreted as part of a pattern in the context of other information about the individual and the institution. Peer and self-evaluations are equally important.

Public issues related to teaching effectiveness did not arise until pupils were required to go to school. To be effective in teaching then was to be a person who attracted students in different places. The criterion of teacher effectiveness was objective and definite, even though the reasons a teacher attracted students were subtle or obscure. A professor, to survive, had to be able to attract students from whom fees were collected directly. A professor who would not attract students had no source of income. The system had a built-in criterion of effectiveness: the ability to attract students from everywhere. Now people go to community colleges, so that the locus of evaluation changes. The purpose of this is to illustrate the idea that community college evaluators should distinguish between what makes a good instructor, and what does not and must distribute rewards accordingly.

Communication Evaluation

This section discusses and analyzes criticisms of teacher evaluations. Many methods of teacher evaluation have been criticized because they are vague, and do not measure specific aspects of teacher behavior (Brophy 1973). In order to cope with vagueness of measurement, Rosenshine (1971) suggested that future research in teaching evaluation should focus on defining levels of discourse used by teachers. Several studies appear in communication education literature describing the development of teacher evaluation instruments. This line of research has resulted in several findings:

1. Common to several factors, analytically derived teacher evaluation instruments are the dimension of *competence* (McCroskey, Holdridge and Toomb, 1974, p. 30); *fairness* (McGlore and Anderson, 1973; Tuckman, 1974); *character* (McCroskey, *et al.*, 1974, p. 30; McGlore and Anderson, 1973; Tuckman, 1974) *sociability* and *organization* (Cronen and Price, 1974; Tuckman, 1974).
2. Evaluations of teacher competence and extroversion are reliable and valid indices of students' willingness to take other courses from an instructor and willingness to recommend to friends that they also take a course from an instructor (McCroskey, *et al.*, 1974, p. 30).

Though meaningful, the above findings beg an important question concerning the relevance of teacher evaluations. The question is whether teacher evaluations are the most appropriate form of instructional evaluation. Even though it may be outdated, B. A. Fisher's (1983) work suggests that teacher evaluations were not as valid an indication of overall course quality as instruments obtaining a more global evaluation of course structure and format. According to Fisher, "While in most cases, one would expect to find high correlations between student evaluations of courses and evaluations of the instructors by peers, the evaluations made by these two groups may not be identical" (p. 32).

Recognizing this distinction, Clevenger, Porter and Bradley (1979) in the Florida State University Communication Research Center developed a semantic differential instrument for evaluating courses, as opposed to instructors. This instrument was brief, could be administered and scored economically, and displayed a factor structure robust across several academic disciplines and all levels of instruction.

Within the instructional environment, if students "trust" their teacher, they are more likely to turn to that person for guidance in their learning efforts and to accept the teacher's influence attempts. Such trust within the instructional setting is most likely to be affected by the way the teacher communicates with the student in their continuing contacts with each other. If what the teacher says and the way the teacher says it make it appear to the student that the teacher has the student's best interest at heart, the level of trust is most likely to increase. Little progress can be made in interpersonal communication unless there is a climate of trust and acceptance.

According to Giffin (1967), whose ideas remain true, trust has been defined as, "...reliance upon the behavior of a person in order to achieve a desired objective," (p. 224-34). In this situation, the behavior instructors can help or hurt students in terms of needs an goals. Students run that risk when trusting another. The trusting and accepting person is confident that the other will behave in such a way that beneficial consequences will result.

Students' trust for their teacher, therefore, is not likely to be a function of a single interaction (unless that interaction is unusually negative). Rather, normally it will be based on a continuing pattern of interactions, founded on an overall impression of the teacher.

Much of the communication research conducted on classroom climate has focused on the dimensions of supportiveness and defensiveness. Rosenfeld (1983, p. 6) established that a classroom climate may be characterized by an underlying level of defensiveness. He found that (1) supportiveness is more important than defensiveness in assessing climate, (2) "liked" classes generally have more supportive than defensive behaviors, (3) liked classes may be characterized by teacher behaviors that are classified as supportive, and (4) disliked classes cause students to develop coping mechanisms (forming alliances against the teacher, not doing what the teacher asks). Furthermore, Rosenfeld and Jarrard (1985, p. 10) discovered that in liked classes, students perceive themselves as important and valued and work toward establishing a "coworker" relationship with the professor.

Cooper (1991) describes classroom communication as a transactional process that is "...complex, symbolic, and has both a content and a relational component" (p. 3). According to Cooper, "...the relationships we create with our students affect us, our students, and the educational outcomes of our instruction" (p. 7). Much of what is discussed in Cooper's text on classroom communication concerns ways of creating and sustaining a supportive classroom climate.

Based on Cooper's comments, it is presumed that a teacher's communicative behavior is interpreted by students through the filter of their perception of that teacher. Within this process, new teacher communication behavior modifies the students' general perception of the teacher. The general perception of the teacher helps the student interpret individual communication behaviors. Thus, research which has accumulated over the past two decades has confirmed that increased nonverbal immediacy by teachers has substantial positive impact on student learning (McCroskey and Richmond, 1992).

Jean Civickly's text (1992, p. 14), *Classroom Communication: Principles and Practice*, views teaching as a "people process," hence communication as the essence of teaching in that it is the means for interactions between students and instructors. The purpose of the text corresponds extremely well to a course designed to look at the classroom as a communication system and to help future teachers see how the system can break down, be repaired, and work effectively to facilitate our ultimate goal of student learning.

Civickly (1992) specifies a "develpmental goal" for the creation of self-monitoring teachers who will be alert to their own reactions and student reactions in order to make adjustments to improve learning. This approach allows instructors to describe options rather than prescribe simple answers. Teachers are thus better prepared for the challenges that will arise throughout their careers as they confront inevitable changes in student needs, situations, grade levels, and teaching styles.

Whether or not educators admit it, the defining characteristic of classroom discourse is a non-egalitarian distribution of power. In almost all cases, a teacher has more power than a student. As a result, interaction is non-reciprocal. In a typical lecture-discussion class, teachers talk more than students and set the topics for discussion. Although both students and teachers ask questions, the functions of these questions differ. Presumably, students ask questions to acquire information; whereas, teachers already know the answers to the questions they ask.

Degree of language formality varies, but generally the syntax and vocabulary used in the classroom are formal, and some topics are relatively impersonal. Certainly, classroom discourse contains more jargon than private forms of talk. The nature of collegiate instruction is to introduce a specialized vocabulary, whose definitions increase communication effectiveness (D. Boileau, personal interview, December 1, 1999).

Teachers' talk is also scripted. If being too prepared in a conversation makes a speaker seem manipulative, being under prepared in the classroom destroys a teacher's credibility. Most teachers preplan their lectures, and some use the same jokes and examples from one year to the next. One of the most difficult tasks in good teaching is finding a way to make standardized material fresh.

According to Clark (1983), the classroom must be managed as a complex, ever-changing communication system composed of multiple human variables. These human variables must determine how communication skills can be employed for the clearest, most appropriate communication in a given situation, in class and out (p. 3).

Since the classroom is a system, it can be approached with all the communication variables that instructors and students find in other communication settings. One can examine classroom communication—listening, critical thinking, and interpersonal skills, as well as self-concept, small groups, public speaking, and oral reading. Some classrooms have dimensions of organizational communication, and some include work in media and culture as part of their activities (Cooper, 1991).

The most important figure in the classroom is obviously the teacher, owing to the power and authority of the position. This power is useful as long as the students respond to it and the teacher avoids abusing it (McCroskey, 1992). A substantial amount of research has been done on how teacher variables influence the communication climate of the classroom.

For example, if the teacher sets a positive tone, respects the students, and treats them with dignity and tolerance, then the teacher's positive attitude becomes part of the pupil's attitude (Cooper, J.M., 1986). A positive attitude then leaves the room free of barriers to good communication and open to more learning behaviors, especially nonverbal communication, that promote closeness, help lower barriers, and increase the positive evaluation students give their teachers. The positive evaluation seems to occur at all levels of education and across cultures (McCroskey, J. C. and Richmond, V.P., 1992).

In recent years, evaluation of teacher performance in the classroom has been a source of significant difficulty and discussion. Research has identified problems in areas such as validity and reliability in teacher evaluation designs (Benson, J., 1987).

The view of teachers' work and evaluation reflected in most of the research in this paper suggests that teachers make educational decisions about what is to be taught, how it is to be taught, and how to evaluate whether or not it has been taught. Then they go into their classrooms, structure orderly learning environments, transmit information to students, and coach them in the mastery of skills. The discipline's primary interest in teachers as communicators has centered on matters of technique that are relatively independent of the intellectual processes of teaching.

Assuming a teacher-centered information transmission model of instruction, research (for example) has featured the use of humor and of non verbal and verbal immediacy behaviors, such as smiling, standing close to students, using vocal variety, referring to students by name, using inclusive pronouns such as "our class." The connection of these behaviors to cognitive learning has required some tortured definitions of learning. More substantial is the connection between variables like immediacy or humor and students' good feelings about a course. Good feelings are attributed to the students' state of arousal, which is linked of motivation, which is linked in turn to learning.

When the definition of instructional communication is reduced to these presentational aspects of teacher behavior, it is small wonder that instructional communication scholarship has not had much impact on the educational community in general. Though good teachers as a group may, in fact, smile more or use more animated voices than poor teachers as a group, does anyone seriously argue that teaching such skills to teachers causes their students to learn more?

A study by McCroskey (1992) affirms the usefulness of the affinity-seeking typology. The authors distinguished between the efforts teachers make to convince students to like their subjects versus themselves and found that teachers also make this distinction. They also found teachers feel less confident in persuading students to like their subjects versus themselves, a problem which may be caused in great part by the fact that teachers, who draw from a very narrow range of affinity-seeking options overall, are especially limited in their strategies to affect subject liking. The authors demonstrate that strategy use differs across grade level taught.

Of particular interest and potential use, according to McCroskey (1992), are these findings:

1. The top six-ranked strategies used to influence personal liking were self-concept confirmation, enjoyment facilitation, trustworthiness, sensitivity, control concession, and solicitation of others' disclosures, followed by self-inclusion, supportiveness, and nonverbal immediacy.
2. Enjoyment facilitation and control concession were the main strategies used to persuade students to like subject matter.

3. Use of reward association in facilitating subject liking, with teachers relying on personal affinity strategies in the earlier grades and on subject affinity strategies later.
4. Four personal affinity strategies tended to be used more often as grade level rose: trustworthiness, sensitivity, self-inclusion, and solicitation of others' disclosures.
5. Enjoyment facilitation, nonverbal immediacy and self-concept confirmation were used proportionately less often as ways to provoke personal affinity at the higher grade levels.

The fact that the data in this study indicate that teachers intentionally use far fewer strategies than they are observed to use means that inservice on various options would be beneficial to teachers who want to have greater influence. But first, as the authors note, further research is needed to better link affinity-seeking strategies with student success (i.e., to provide a firm base for the assumption that the development of affinity for teacher and subject should be an important concern to every teacher).

Critical theorists raise a number of troublesome questions about all the models that diminish and trivialize the intellectual work of teaching. Apple (1988) and Giroux (1988, 31) explicate the "de-skilling" of teachers, observing that they are increasingly cast in the role of technicians who manage classrooms and implement "teacher-proof" curricula designed by others. This process of deprofessionalizing educators is not unlike the trend toward replacing intellectually trained journalists with attractive news readers who project an appealing media image.

According to Duke (1984), "As teachers have been required to follow behavioral objectives, use programmed texts, adhere to competency-based lessons, and prepare their students for standardized tests, their latitude of professional judgement has been reduced... In compensation, the nonacademic demands have increased with more extracurricular duties, playground, and hours of deadly record keeping," (p.180). Duke adds that in short, that as jobs become less professional, they become more clerical and custodial. Teachers are generally isolated from one another and discouraged from taking collective action in their schools (p. 180).

The progressive de-skilling of teachers' work can be reversed. Urgent calls for reform advocate upgrading the intellectual preparation of teachers (Green, 1986), making them more reflective (Schoon, 1987) and more inquiry-oriented Zeichner (1983) ideas though outdated emphasizes the idea of finding ways to replace assembly-line metaphors with narrative metaphors that emphasize the role teachers play in creating meaning (Egan, 1986). By far the most significant contemporary treatment of the emancipatory potential of the teacher's role is Giroux (1988), *Teachers As Intellectuals*. Giroux maintains that schools, by their very definition, are the sites where ideas and human experience come into contact.

Teachers are inevitably intellectuals, then, however effectively or ineffectively they are prepared for the role, for they are the ones who are present in the moment of contact between students and theory or conceptualized application.

When teachers recognize that they are intellectuals, they can choose to act as transformative intellectuals, according to Giroux. A transformative intellectual is not merely concerned with giving students the knowledge and skills they need for economic and social mobility, but with helping them discover the moral and political dimensions of a just society and the means of creating it. The actualization of Giroux's grand vision depends almost exclusively on the communication skills of the teacher.

No discipline is better positioned in teacher competence than communication. Communication plays a central role in the creation of knowledge. With its long heritage of dialectical inquiry, this discipline should be leading other teacher educators in developing sophisticated, communication-based forms of pedagogy that would elevate the teacher's role. "Instead, we seem to be lagging and investigating technical variables that perpetuate the notion of the teacher as a mere presenter of information or manager of classroom behavior," (Giroux, p. 33). This section of communication uses evaluation as a system of quality control in which it may be determined at each step in the teaching and learning process whether the process is effective or not; and if not, what changes can be made to ensure effectiveness. Yet for the most part, student evaluations do measure specific communication variables.

Improving Instructional Effectiveness

Education uses evaluation in many ways, but the area most directly related to teaching learning activities is determining the extent of student learning. Improving teaching effectiveness is not merely a function of effective rewards systems, but rather a collaborative and participatory function of several factors working to improve not only what goes on in the classroom, but to improve the quality of faculty.

Hobson (1974) defined accountability as a condition that places much responsibility and demand on teachers for output resulting from their involvement in teaching and their use of resources. According to this position, the idea is that the teacher assumes greater responsibility and obligation for providing adequate and effective instruction. It is the responsibility of the teacher to use innovative instructional methods, such as participatory lectures, experimental projects, case studies, panel discussions, and simulations to transfer knowledge and learning to students. In order to become effective, teachers must learn a body of knowledge essential for teaching, such as how to prepare for and deliver instruction.

Wynne (1981), Ravitch (1984) and Banks (1991) indicated that teachers who are effective use instructional time appropriately, setting objectives and learning strategies related to student needs; and they use handouts and material, in addition to textbooks. Wynne adds "they are friendly, warm, democratic, stimulating, imaginative, enthusiastic, and philosophical" (p. 12).

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness is therefore a complex, multi-factored problem, rather than a simple, single-factored one. Because it is a complex problem, many people have begun to wonder whether valid and reliable methods have been, or can be developed to evaluate teaching effectiveness and, in the first place, whether it is necessary.

Cronen and Price (1974), whose ideas are true today, reports the rapid spread of a drive among college students all over the United States to evaluate their professors with respect to knowledge of subject matter, teaching effectiveness, and personality. It is questionable, however, if the totality of the student body has the knowledge, experience, and ability to evaluate the professor with a proper degree of accuracy and fairness. The selective student opinion may be helpful and may be taken as an axiom. However, administrators and faculty should alert themselves to the necessity of devising a system of careful, periodic, objective evaluation of each faculty member's capabilities, performance, and promise in the realms of scholarship, teaching ability, skill in guidance of students, and in other requisite qualities of higher education.

This issue is not whether teaching effectiveness should be evaluated, since such judgments are inevitable. The real issue is whether the criteria developed to evaluate teaching effectiveness are valid and reliable. Bloom (1971) states that since teaching can be described as a purposeful activity designed to enhance learning, it can be evaluated, analyzed, and appraised. Contrell (1966), who offers knowledge which is true of education today, further observes that since education is a phenomenon of human experience, it can be studied in concrete terms, it can be observed in both process and results, theories can be propounded to explain it, and it can be controlled experimentally.

Accountability

An ingredient to look for in a successful student classroom experience is accountability for the learning activity. Since learning is a self activity, students need to know they are responsible for the learning activity; the students need to know they are responsible for learning. When there is a specific objective, they need to think of it as an objective they must reach, not one the instructor must *make* them reach. In the case of a small group activity, homework or outside reading, learners must feel that they have the responsibility for reaching the particular learning goal in the assignment. The instructor should plan activities that will let learners take some responsibility for the learning.

Professional instructors are held accountable for several criteria. First and foremost is knowledge of their subject matter. They must also be concerned for the welfare of students and the students' right to just treatment. Educators must be held responsible for understanding human behavior. Students in community colleges must be treated as adults. They must be treated as partners. They must be treated with dignity and respect. This understanding plays a crucial role in teachers' influence upon students. Furthermore, teachers are held accountable for the methods they use in the classroom. According to Hodge (1996), "There are no truly right or wrong methods; however, we are beginning to understand that methods must be tailored to fit the instructor, the school, curriculum, and the institution in which they are being used," (p. 32). Knowledge of subject matter is measured by degrees held by the instructor and/or the amount of graduate work and the knowledge level held by students.

According to Fullan (1991), research is clear, however, that schools led by educators who are strong instructional leaders are more collegial and productive. Fullan reported in *The New Meaning of Education*

Change (1991, p. 41) that the most effective administrators are interested in and knowledgeable about instruction. They show an active interest by spending time talking, planning, and helping teachers; and they are knowledgeable about what is happening in education. The argument is that while there are differences in approaches toward teacher evaluations, there are institutions with excellent evaluation systems because of approaches taken by effective administrators and instructors.

According to sociologist Rosebeth Moss Kanter, delegating power effectively, such as giving faculty responsibility and authority for decision making, not only allows for faculty growth and development, it also enhances the power of the learner. D. K. Miller (1986) states that evaluation and instruction in learning are inseparable and that both implicit and explicit objectives should coincide to allow for meaningful objectives. Rational determination of objectives requires consideration of change in amount and direction. Evaluation all too often emphasizes errors and ignores strengths. Instruction requires providing opportunities for the student to practice behavior stated in faculty objectives. Students should recognize shared responsibility for effectiveness, and evaluation should be learned experience for both teacher and student. Basic to an understanding of evaluative strategies is the recognition of evaluation as a feedback mechanism that is essential if people are to learn from their experiences. Accountability is a practice that ascertains whether alternative procedures are equally effective or not in achieving a set of educational ends.

Measuring Learning

In addition to the issues and problems associated with direct student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, issues and problems associated with using data emanate from attempts to measure the extent of student learning. First of all, student achievement records can be used to evaluate effectiveness, *if instructors can measure the knowledge, skills, and attitudes* that students have acquired as a result of their instruction.

Yet sometimes instructors use the measurement of a student's relative standing in a class as evidence that learning has occurred as a result of a specific program of instruction, perhaps encouraging the student to take advanced classes with the same instructor maybe in organizational, interpersonal or advanced public speaking.

In doing so, variables can be controlled to the extent that learning can be validly related to a specific program of instruction, while the relationship between instruction and the extent of learning can be best determined by analyzing the results of instructor prepared examinations.

The relationship between instruction and the extent of student learning can also be determined by analyzing the results of an externally prepared examination. However, we must remember that the relationship between instruction and the extent of student learning cannot be validly determined without pre- and post-test data. Measurement techniques have been developed to the point where instructors can accept achievement test scores as valid and reliable indicators of teaching effectiveness. Instructors can also develop the ability to interpret the meaning of examination scores of tests in which either all students scored extremely high or all students scored extremely low. If all students score high, the usual reaction is to find fault with the examination, rather than give credit to the quality of instruction and/or the achievement of objectives. If all students score low, the usual reaction is to either find fault with the examination or to blame students, rather than faulting the quality of instruction. These reactions show that teacher effectiveness is inherently difficult to assess because of the long-range outcomes built into the basic art of teaching.

There seems little need to offer an extensive justification for the existence of teacher evaluation. Among educators it is, in fact, one of the few areas in which there is agreement. Evaluation is also viewed as an accountability act. While there is often some argument at the local level about the espoused versus the real purpose of evaluation, educators overall are in accord regarding its general purpose: to safeguard and improve the quality of instruction received by students (Bolton, 1973). Bolton's functions of teacher evaluation have some relevance in educational settings today, even though his work is outdated. Bolton lists the following specific functions of teacher evaluation as the means for fulfilling this major purpose (p. 288):

1. To improve teaching through the identification of ways to change teaching systems, teaching environments, or teaching behaviors.
2. To supply information that will lead to the modification of assignments, such as placement in other positions, promotions, and terminations.
3. To protect students from incompetence and teachers from unprofessional administrators.
4. To reward superior performance.
5. To validate the school system's teacher selection process.
6. To provide a basis for teachers' career planning and professional development.

Certainly the major difficulties associated with developing effective teacher evaluation systems are well documented, even though some may be historical. They include such things as "poor teacher-supervisor attitudes towards evaluation" (Wagoner and O'Hanlon, 1968, p. 11). According to Raths (1982), "There are difficulties in separating formative and summative evaluation," (p. 12). Popham (1981) thinks the problem is "inadequate measurement devices" (p. 6); "lack of reliable and consistent teaching criteria" is the problem according to Travers (1981, p.

22); "lack of reliable data collection techniques" is the problem according to Scriven (1981, p. 14); "faliibility of standard feedback mechanisms" is the problem, according to McKeachie (1976, p. 33); and "general lack of training of teachers and supervisors in the evaluation process" is a concern to McGreal (1980, p. 16).

Teachers also are critical of evaluation procedures. They often contend that assessment methods are inappropriate: the performance criteria by which they are judged are either unspecified or too general; classroom observations are infrequent and superficial; the factors evaluated often have little relationship to instructional skill; and results either are not communicated or are not useful in improving performance. In studies conducted by Natriello and Wilson (1980, p. 81), teachers noted that they viewed their evaluation systems as generally unsound, overly subjective, and unaffected by their efforts. Teachers in these studies indicated that they were uninformed about the information collected to evaluate their performance and that minimal time was taken to communicate evaluation results to them.

Levin (1979), in a summary of research on teacher evaluation is current. Levin argues that, "research provides little support for current practices in teacher evaluation." He goes on to comment, "One of the few things that can be safely said is that the prevalent system of evaluation through observation by supervisors is biased and subjective.

The use of techniques that have greater promise for providing objective data, such as an observation instrument is as yet uncommon" (p. 68).

Manatt (1982), a major proponent of an evaluation model, advocates an evaluation system manifesting these features:

1. Teacher involvement in the evaluation process.
2. Centralized and collaborative development of performance criteria.
3. Goal Setting.
4. Multi-dimensional methods of assessing teacher skills, including objective data gathering and self and peer evaluation.
5. Analysis of results with teachers and development of specific job targets for improvement.

Following a comprehensive analysis of current teacher evaluation practices, Edgarton, Lynton, and Rice (1992) specify four minimal conditions for a successful teacher evaluation:

1. All individuals in the system understand the criteria and processes for teacher evaluation.
2. All participants understand how these criteria and processes relate to the basic goals of the organization; i.e, there is a shared sense that the criteria reflect the most important aspects of teaching and that the evaluation system is consonant with their educational goals and conceptions of teaching.

3. Teachers perceive that the evaluation procedures enable and motivate them to improve their performance.
4. All individuals in the evaluation perceive that the evaluation procedure allows them to strike a balance between adaptation and stability to handle unanticipated demands.

An analysis of thirty-two highly developed, recent teacher evaluation systems across the country completed by the Rand Corporation under the sponsorship of the National Institute of Education provides insights regarding evaluation practices. With regard to teacher evaluation, McLaughlin (1982) adds, "There is a scant agreement about instrumentation, frequency of evaluation, role of the teacher in the process, how the information could or should inform. In other words, little consensus exists about the best practice" (p. 18).

Self-Assessment by Teachers

Bailey's (1967) assessments, which are of current interest, suggest a systematic and comprehensive approach to instructional improvement activities. Seven steps to teacher self-assessment are presented to help the experienced and the beginning teacher analyze and improve classroom teaching behavior. The seven steps suggested by Bailey (p. 18) include:

1. Gaining a philosophical view by examining myths surrounding teacher self-assessment.
2. Using media.
3. Identifying basic teaching behaviors of set and closure.
4. Identifying nonverbal cues.
5. Planning instructional behaviors with means-referenced objectives.
6. Using observation forms.

What makes a good teacher? Is it warmth, humor, and caring about people? Is it planning, hard work, and self discipline? What about leadership, enthusiasm, a contagious love of learning, and speaking ability? Most people would agree that all these are needed to make someone a good teacher, and they would certainly be correct. But these qualities are not enough.

The first thing a teacher must have is some knowledge or skills the learner does not have; teachers must know the subject matter they expect to teach. Knowledge of how to transmit information and skills is at least as important as knowledge of the information and skills themselves.

For effective teaching, subject matter knowledge is not a question of being a walking encyclopedia. Effective teachers not only know their subjects, they can also communicate their knowledge to students. The link between what the teacher wants students to learn and students' actual learning is called instruction, or pedagogy. Effective instruction is not a simple matter of one person with more knowledge transmitting that knowledge to another. Rather, effective instruction demands the use of many strategies.

Teachers in community colleges should make sure that the class is orderly and that the students know what is expected of them. They must find out whether students have the prerequisite skills. According to Levin (1979, p. 11),

> If they do not, teachers must find a way to teach students those skills. They must engage students in activities that lead toward an understanding of the subject matter. Teachers may ask questions, or use quizzes, or have students demonstrate their understanding by setting up and interpreting in order to see whether students are learning what is being taught; and they must respond appropriately if these assessments show that students are having problems. These tasks--motivating students, managing the classroom, assessing prior knowledge, communicating ideas effectively, taking into account the characteristics of the learners, assessing leaning outcomes, and reviewing information--must be attended at levels of education in the class room.

Evaluation and instruction in learning are inseparable, and both implicit and explicit objectives should coincide to allow for meaningful objectives. Rational determination of objectives requires consideration of change in amount and direction. Evaluation all too often emphasizes errors and ignores strengths. Instruction requires providing opportunities for the student to practice behavior stated in faculty objectives. Students should recognize shared responsibility for effectiveness, and evaluation should be learned experience for both teacher and student.

The contention is that one can criticize the mechanistic and the alleged pseudoscientific nature of evaluation instruments. Only human thought can provide answers to the problems of evaluation. Human beings--not questionnaires, not evaluation instruments, not computers--produce evaluations. There are no objections to evaluation of teachers by human observers. Criticism of humans by humans is considered fair play. Instructors may object only to the evaluation of humans by "instruments" and "mechanisms" to which are attributed superhuman powers of perception, precision, and perspicacity. The point here is that since all evaluations may not be objective in measuring learning, taking them as a first-rate value may not be the true measure of learning.

Spencer and Aleamoni (1970) raised important issues of evaluation, even though they are outdated. They wrote an article that describes an instrument which elicits students' opinions about a standardized set of statements relative to certain aspects of an instructional program and the norms which enable an instructor to compare results with results of other instructors. This version of the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) consisted of fifty short statements to which the student responded by indicating agreement or disagreement on a four-point scale. Normative data were established on more than one hundred thousand students, two thousand course sections, and four hundred different courses. Administrators of the CEQ to a number of institutions indicate that the normative data are relatively stable from institution to institution.

Borge (1967) presents fundamental opinions which are true today on the need for using student opinion on any form in the evaluation process, for there has been a lack of scientific basis for the educational practice of evaluation. Evaluation does not eliminate the need for value judgment.

Anderson (1963) wrote an interesting article which discusses pupils, evaluators, and administrators and what they consider in the evaluation process. Anderson stated that these three groups view the evaluation process very differently and consider the teacher as a competent leader in the classroom. A step toward better understanding of the problems relating to teacher competency may be the intensive and extensive study of teacher characteristics.

J. Wilson's (1974) manual provides basic information necessary for administering and scoring its questionnaires and suggests possible modifications for adapting the general formats to meet local circumstances. The questionnaires were developed as part of a study of teaching and teacher evaluation conducted by the Center For Evaluation at Harvard. Each form provides a description of teaching and an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Scales and items focus on a description of teaching and provide the individual instructor with a profile of his or her behavior as perceived by students or colleagues, while the evaluation questions provide information on the overall perceived effectiveness of teaching practices. Four teacher description questionnaires are available, and medium and short versions are available for each. Two are based on student evaluations and two on colleague evaluations.

Slarks's (1997) document of evaluation presents data tables and graphs on the performance levels in the Rancho Santiago Community College District for each of its 12 success measures. The 12 measures included are access to students, persistence, basic skills completion, graduation, transfer, student satisfaction, matriculation of continuing education students to college credit coursework, job upgrading and lifelong learning, job placement, faculty and staff, financial indicators, and each department's own unique goal.

Wellsfry (1995) helps ensure that the unique characteristics of community college occupational education are reflected in the current national movement toward institutional accountability. This monograph describes a model accountability system for evaluation in community colleges. Hudgins (1998) indicates the institutional effectiveness movement has emerged on the higher education agenda because of increased global competition, decreased funding levels, and a loss of public confidence in higher education. Pascarella (1997) suggests that surprisingly little research is devoted to community colleges and that it is time to pay attention to these widely attended institutions because of the need to assess their effectiveness in meeting student needs.

Bailey (1967) reviewed teacher evaluation using the following three models: (1) teacher evaluation by external evaluators, (2) teacher evaluation through student feedback, and (3) teacher evaluation based upon self assessment. Bailey opts for the third, indicating that the best hope for improving instruction lies in a process in which teachers identify, control, or change their own behavior.

Bogdan (1978) describes evaluation as a celebration. He asserts that useful studies are limited in number and quality and that it is virtually impossible to assign students randomly in tightly controlled experimental designs. Bogdan sets forth a modest proposal:

1. Describe the good things that teachers do.
2. Use a variety of tools to make this description.
3. Describe worthwhile projects and activities over a long period of time to determine whether they hold up.
4. Celebrate successes, rather than focus upon failures and shortcomings.

Miller (1986) states that effective teaching is characterized by knowing and respecting the self, seeking to improve the instructor, and setting goals to increase professional skills. These characteristics all assist one to become an effective teacher. Learning to grow from mistakes, honestly facing and confronting those who do not fulfill their obligations and duties, and recognizing what can be corrected, while not attempting to fight battles that are impossible to win—all these characteristics, too, make for a healthy, competent teacher.

Summary

The review of literature suggests there is a relationship between communication behaviors and perceptions of learning by students.

Reading the literature review involved revealing definitions and descriptions of variables in the study along with relationships among those and other variables. This study provided information about the types of evaluations which are peer and student evaluations. It offers criticism by discussing communication evaluation, improving instructional effectiveness and accountability and provides useful procedures for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Communication evaluations provide insight about work that has been done and ways to extend previous studies.

The evaluator gathered information and used it to make judgments about related events, then presented alternatives in specific educational settings. Improving teaching effectiveness enhanced teacher methods in subject matter, in teacher expectation of students, and in teacher attitude toward change. Accountability required a wide knowledge of education and the use of evaluative information as feedback about the product of student learning effectiveness. Measuring learning is a way to perform observation by providing information about specified indications of teaching the and learning. The section on self assessment is intended to obtain the wealth of information about teachers' feelings that may be difficult to identify in other ways. The emphasis throughout this study is upon understanding the process of formulating the research question and communicating the results of the inquiry on teacher effectiveness. The review of the literature was conducted by locating, evaluating, and synthesizing reports of research, expert opinion and all information related to the problem.

The three research questions are:

1. What is the nature of faculty evaluation of teaching effectiveness in the community colleges of Maryland and Virginia?
2. What is the nature of the student forms used to evaluate teaching effectiveness?
3. To what extent do the questions on the teacher evaluation form cover teaching effectiveness?

CHAPTER 3

Methodology And Research Design

Introduction

It is a fact that content analysis methods may be applied to virtually any form of communication. The topic of evaluating teaching effectiveness with the use of student evaluation and applying Mannat's criteria is more appropriately addressed by content analysis than by any other method of inquiry. Probably the greatest advantage of content analysis is its economy in terms of both time and money. It might be feasible for a single college student to undertake a content analysis; whereas, undertaking a survey might not be feasible. There is no requirement for a large research staff; no special equipment is required. As long as there is access to the material to be coded, one could undertake and apply content analysis to data.

Content Analysis

The methodology to be used in the research study is content analysis—a planned process of investigation. It proceeds carefully, in a step-by-step manner, employing an ordered system of inquiry. "Content analysis is a research technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying characteristics within a text," according to

Stone, Dunphy, Smith, & Ogilvie (1966, p. 25). This idea, though ancient, is true of all types of content analysis.

For communication researchers, content analysis involves identifying and examining messages contained in a text. In the context of this research, the researcher identified community colleges in Virginia and Maryland. These different evaluation forms were located and analyzed based on their effectiveness in evaluating teaching in the classroom. In order to save time, energy, and money and to gain first-hand experience and knowledge, the researcher selected forms from eight forms because it is the researcher's opinion that the forms from almost all the community colleges in Virginia and Maryland are very similar. Therefore, these eight sample evaluation forms included in this project reflect all the questions asked by all the institutions. These forms appear as pages 81-91 of this paper.

The researcher will carefully examine, identify, and count the specific questions, statements, and words from student evaluations that consider teaching effectiveness in the classroom. The different evaluation forms will be analyzed in order to answer the research questions of the project. Each form will be examined carefully to see which questions fit a given set of criteria and which questions directly address teacher performance. (1) Does the evaluation form have questions dealing with the knowledge of the teacher? (This means how the teacher applies ideas to the classroom.) (2) How prepared is the teacher? (3) How well does the teacher explain the course concepts? (4) What examples does the teacher give to help clarify difficult terms? The researcher will engage in content analysis of responses on evaluation forms.

When one looks at the history of content analysis, it was developed primarily as a method of studying mass mediated public messages. Indeed, the roots of content analysis stretch back to the eighteenth century, when scholars in Sweden counted the number of religious symbols contained in a collection of 90 hymns in order to see whether the authors of the hymns were preaching against the church (Dovring, 1955). Dovring was the first to apply the basics of content analysis, which makes it a significant reference. This technique was able to show through analysis that authors of the hymns were not preaching against the church.

The Research Design

Using content analysis, the research design is a comprehensive data collection plan whose purpose is to answer the three research questions. A content analysis investigation identified the research problem, determined a suitable data base, selected a sample, collected contextual information, developed a measurement scheme, and analyzed the data.

Nature of Faculty Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

At the community college level, the dean must encourage and develop college activities and programs that reward teaching, as well as develop short-term and long-time strategies that will assist faculty to improve teaching performance. College teachers are hired with the expectation that they will become more effective teachers. The systematic evaluation of teachers by their students is a logical extension of this expectation. If students need feedback to correct their learning mistakes, faculty members also need appropriate feedback to correct their teaching mistakes.

Evaluation instruments that measure teaching performance must be collaboratively developed. Department chairs (or coordinators) in community colleges must be the instructional leaders of their departments. In such a role, they must develop strategies that refocus faculty efforts toward improving teaching performance, plans and goals, adequate resources, collegial relationships, and departmental activities that recognize and promote teaching. Community college teachers could become more effective if they improved their quality of teaching through

(1) collegial interaction

(2) professional development

(3) exposure to new ways of teaching

(4) changes of attitudes that teaching is, after all, a scholarly activity.

The Nature of Questions in Student Evaluation Forms

The second research question which must be addressed concerns the nature of questions in student evaluation forms. The validity and reliability of questions used in student evaluation forms depend on whether the questions measure or identify something important in a learning environment. (For example, are they based upon sound learning theory in relation to the purposes of instruction in a specific course?) Questions should avoid soliciting value judgments or comparisons that students may not be qualified to make. Questions should provide feedback to which the instructor will be able to respond after the data are collected, thus facilitating the quality of instruction.

Extent To Which Teacher Evaluation Forms Analyze Teaching Effectiveness

The third research question concerns the extent to which teacher evaluation forms analyze teaching effectiveness. One requirement of valid teacher evaluation, whether formative or summative, is that multiple data sources be used for each teacher. The selection of sources can be customized for each teacher's impact, context, and style. For example, one teacher may present data on student gain, parent surveys, pupil reports, and teacher tests; whereas, a second teacher may use peer review, administrative report, systematic observation, student focus groups, and documentation of professional activities.

Using multiple data sources addresses a number of problems found in conventional teacher evaluation. No single data source is sufficiently reliable, works for all practitioners, addresses all that a teacher does, will be supported by all teachers, or is agreed to by all educators. In addition, excellence in teaching comes in a variety of configurations and areas of performance. As Travers (1981, p. 61) said, "If a school can justify evaluating all teachers through identical procedures, then the school is probably devoid of innovations." Questionnaires rarely adapt to distinguishing among the conditions of teaching: large lectures, skill based performance classes, small classes, lecture with lab, etc.

Variable data sources are needed in teaching evaluation because good teachers are good for different reasons. Teachers can make learning happen in quite different ways. Good teaching comes in a variety of forms and styles. Some teachers are good because of their ability to choose materials. Others are especially strong because of their insights into learners and into subject matter. Still others use engaging personalities, while some rely on experience. Some teachers are effective because they are innovative, others because they so well apply tried and true traditions of teaching.

What makes one teacher good (an effective task master) may not be true of the next one (an inspirer), or still another (a subject matter authority). One thing that allows for this variety in teacher quality is that while much of the teaching is simple and straight-forward and is done by everyone in the same way, other teacher tasks can be quite personal and idiosyncratic, creative, emotionally demanding, and intellectually complex. At times, teaching is replication and at other times, innovation, depending on the situation. Finally, students have different styles, needs, and preferences in their learning. Good teachers match teaching performance to student needs. Thus, the kinds of information that are most helpful in understanding quality vary from one teacher to another. A good teacher evaluation system recognizes these differences and provides for variation in data sources.

Because the use of multiple data sources emphasizes the individuality of teachers, it is inevitable that objective data will lead to comparisons of teachers among themselves. These comparisons may conflict with teacher cultural values that favor cooperation and non-competitive interaction (Johnson, 1990).

Representative Sample

With the data base clarified, the researcher selected a representative sample of data. The eight forms chosen, unlike the forms which were not selected, show some interesting questions in terms of validity and have different, challenging issues raised by the specific community college. A positive research finding is that most questions on evaluating teaching effectiveness by students show objectives—or the content on which it is based—and the type of learning it measures. Most of the questions fit the criteria of what makes for effective instruction. There are, however, some questions that may be revised by changing descriptions to be more plausible and specific. The reader can find in the Appendices (A through H) the listing of the following student evaluation forms used for this investigation:

1. Catonsville Community College Student Evaluation (MD)
2. J. Sergeant Reynolds Community College (VA)
3. Dabney S. Lancaster Community College (VA)
4. Montgomery Community College (MD)
5. Baltimore City Community College (MD)
6. Chesapeake Community College (MD)
7. Averett Community College (VA)
8. Northern Virginia Community College (all campuses) (VA)

Developing a Measurement System

Both the sample data, which consist of evaluation questionnaires given to community college students, and pertinent contextual information about teaching effectiveness have been collected. The researcher performs the task in content analysis by devising a scheme for measuring data. The scheme will be to compare and analyze evaluation forms submitted by students in community colleges to determine teaching effectiveness. For purposes of this study, judgments about teaching effectiveness are based on four criteria, which are competencies of an effective teacher. The researcher added criteria based on other studies of teaching effectiveness to the four major categories suggested by Mannat. The resulting criteria are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness

Planning	**Technical Skills**	**Instructional Skills**	**Classroom Management**
Identifying Set and Closure	Motivating Students	Identifying Non Verbal Cues	Superior Personality
Organization	Knowledge of Subject Matter	Communicating Ideas Effectively	Good Judgment and Reasoning
Learning Outcomes	Assessing Prior Knowledge	Explaining Concepts	
Preparation			
Mean-Referenced Objectives	Using Observation Forms		

The criteria chosen to answer the nature of questions in student evaluations and measure of teaching effectiveness are

1. Planning
2. Technical Skills
3. Instructional Skills
4. Classroom Management

The behaviors that these four criteria represent are worth noting.

Planning

Planning Instructional Behavior. The goal of planning instructional behavior is to teach students how to do something with life communication skills. It goes beyond thoughts and ideas and gets into specific ways to act or perform tasks. If the topic were how to give presentations, students learning at the behavioral level would actually design, write, and give presentations to the class.

When planning an educational activity one should think in terms of drafting a content plan. What content needs to be covered? How can this content be organized into manageable units? How can the material be transmitted in a logical sequence? What would be the most effective method for transmitting this content? With regard to this criteria, instructors in community colleges should enhance or learn the skills needed to formulate, implement and evaluate classroom instruction at any level.

Set and Closure. Both ice breakers and openers are start-up activities that help participants ease into the program. Regardless of the participants' prior acquaintances with one another, an opener would seem to be quite desirable in any program. Just as the opening was important, particularly for climate setting, the closing is equally important and should be well planned. The impression should be conveyed that the next step is the anticipated change.

Organization. Every classroom has a climate, even if instructors cannot always identify it with certainty. As climate changes, so must the methodology change for the instructor's activities. It becomes incumbent on the instructor to sense continually the subtle changes in the climate.

Learning Outcomes. A good instructor is student oriented, just as a good communicator is receiver oriented. At all times in a classroom session, instructors are concerned with what the adult learner is getting from the program. Are instructors facilitating the learning process or just presenting material? If instructors have adult learners as central to teaching method, the instructors will focus on doing rather than just listening or watching. They will utilize their experience and motivators to help them get the most from the teaching. They will place the teaching program in a proper perspective, recognizing that classroom instruction is only a part of their lives. Instructors will be practical and concrete in approach, and adapt not only to the students' needs, but also to their learning rates and styles and outcomes.

Technical Skills

Much teaching is not technical in nature and requires special considerations. First is the frequent need for equipment, such as computer terminals or models of field equipment. The instructor should have freedom to move about, have access to the individuals working on the equipment, and be able to get the entire class's attention and be seen by them. In relation to the technical criteria, instructors in community colleges should develop skill and confidence in providing classroom instruction in their areas of expertise by introducing essentials of good instruction. Such essentials include the principles of learning, ways to motivate adult learners and the mechanics of instruction.

Motivating Students. As adults, students may not need instant gratification. Many students are motivated by teaching that may provide a future reward, rather than immediate satisfaction. Because students have a history, they are more aware of long-term, as well as short-term goals. Students may recognize that teaching is designed to improve our communication.

Knowledge of Subject Matter. Learning involves acquiring some kind of knowledge. Knowledge itself does not change performance, though it may have some influence. This statement does not mean that knowledge is not important. Quite the contrary, most students want to know the why of an expected performance. There are the times when students seek more knowledge than they can ever use. Such thirst should not be discouraged, but must be balanced against the problem, expected performance, the needs of the learner, and the resources available.

Using Observation Forms. Observation forms are particularly useful when the learning cannot be observed and where measurement is not a factor. Observation forms should be kept simple and should relate directly to real life experiences. What is meant by observation forms is more a matter of measurement, the classification of things observed. It is sometimes appropriate to base measurements on direct observation. Instructors can learn much by just looking and listening to what transpires.

Instructional Skills

Identifying Nonverbal Cues. Instructors' nonverbals may be conscious or unconscious and may have five important characteristics: (1) They always communicate something; (2) they are bound to the situation; (3) they are believed; (4) they are seldom isolated; and (5) they affect our relationships. We decide three important things about people largely based on nonverbal communication: (a) personal liking or attraction; (b) evaluation of the power relationships; (c) feelings of responsiveness. All these nonverbals are important in a teaching interaction or transaction.

Communicating Ideas Effectively. Good communicators are also most knowledgeable in the critical areas of the communication process—perception, language, logical thinking, and presentation. According to L. Ross (1977, pp. 49-50), instructors should:

1. Help students become effective critical thinkers, language users, organizers, and ethical purveyors of messages.
2. Help students learn that receivers are coactive participants in the communication process who affectively, cognitively, or behaviorally respond to messages.

3. Ross (1977) adds that instructors can help students understand that meaning is heavily dependent on individual experience and the realities their social constructions allow.
4. Help students transfer the communication fundamentals to all other forms of communication.

Explaining Concepts. Instructors can inform and explain ideas and concepts that are more abstract, such as theories of persuasion, principles of navigation, meditation, philosophy, aesthetics, etc. Not all students and audiences are eagerly waiting to hear what the instructor has to say. Instructors must present material not only in a clear and interesting way, but also in a way that makes learning, remembering, and applying the information easy.

It is important to look at those variables in specific context. The instructor is the ultimate "delivery agent" of the learning system. Instructors therefore manage the critical dynamic process: acquisition of new behaviors by the learner. "This implies skill in bringing to life all the content and all the methods called for in the lesson plan. It implies skill in two-way communication. It implies flexibility, spontaneity, empathy, compassion—almost everything except for feeding multitudes with but five loaves and two fishes," (Laird, 1985, p. 36). Even though it is out of date, this idea demonstrates fairness, which ought to be based on teachers' effectiveness.

The truth is that in recent years perception of the effective instructor has changed sharply. We are more and more concerned with skills in facilitating learning in others. The emphasis is on questioning and listening, on getting feedback and positive reinforcement into the learning experience.

Classroom Management

Most people like to think of the instructor as being the great leader and producer of learning, a view that can be softened considerably by suggesting that the best way to think of the instructor is as a facilitator of learning. Effective classroom management implies that the aim of every instructor is to provide opportunities for learning. If it means getting little or no credit for the outcome, then that effort or dedication should be a consideration. Instructors who exhibit defensive behavior in the classroom are avoiding the task of helping students.

Superior Personality. Modern theorists, from past to present, have come a long way in identifying personality needs. Yet these needs remain somewhat like memory—difficult to grasp. Schutz (1958) has theorized that each of us associates with groups in order to meet three interpersonal needs: (1) inclusion, (2) control, and (3) affection. Inclusion refers to our concern for belonging (feeling part of, and being together with others). Control refers to areas of power, influence, and authority. Affection refers to emotional intimacy between persons. In each of these three areas, instructors and students have both the need to receive these behaviors from others and the need to express such behaviors towards others.

Good Judgment and Reasoning. Whichever type of judgment or reasoning an instructor chooses to use (deductive, inductive, causal, or analogic), the teacher should be able to handle evidence effectively.

The instructor brings to the classroom a certain amount of knowledge and experience, usually more than learners possess. If the instructor has not had more actual years of experience, probably he or she has had more meaningful experience—experience that is organized and prepared for sharing with others. The measurement of the criteria and sub-categories of the questions on student evaluations will be made by an analysis of the content of student questionnaires from community colleges in Virginia and Maryland. For measurement purposes, the criteria are simple and easy to understand. The criteria are reliable as they measure what they measure, which is teacher effectiveness. They are fair and unbiased. They reflect the performance of the teacher in a typical classroom. They identify performance areas in the classroom. They are consistent, and some measures validate other measures.

CHAPTER 4

Findings and Discussion

Criteria and Questions

The following analysis was designed to find out about the validity of questions community college administrators ask students about their experiences with teachers. The goal of the analysis was to discover the nature of the questions in student evaluations; and of those questions, which ones analyze teaching effectiveness. The task included looking at criteria and matching them to questions on evaluation forms in order to determine whether there is a correspondence between the criteria and the evaluation questions (Appendices A-H). The two items in correlation are lists of questions and of criteria. The listed criteria measure teaching effectiveness, while the evaluation questions provide the data base.

In order to have a data collection to test, the researcher solicited evaluation forms from all the community colleges in the Maryland and Virginia area. The researcher chose to discuss eight of the forms because they are unique to the nature of this study. They are the best questionnaires because they come directly from the institutions studied. The questionnaires are labeled as appendices and can be found at the end of this study.

My goal was to test each question on the selected questionnaires against the communicative criteria to determine validity and reliability about each question. The researcher chose four criteria suggested by Mannat (1982) because these criteria effectively assess teaching effectiveness. Mannat's criteria are (1) planning, (2) technical skills, (3) instructional skills, and (4) class room management. Each question was tested to find out the extent to which it measures teaching effectiveness. Based on the philosophy that an evaluation instrument should help teachers grow, Mannat's (1982) research, which is true to this day, presents a teacher-evaluation plan designed to measure objectively four criteria: Planning, technical skills, instructional skills, and classroom management. While these criteria may not be the only ones applicable, they provide a framework for observing teachers because the criteria specify what is expected and how performance will be judged.

Added to this list are supporting behaviors suggested by Bailey (1978). The supporting criteria and skill components include: Identifying basic teaching behaviors of set and closure, organization, assessing learning outcomes, preparation, planning instructional behavior with means referenced objectives. All the stated criteria fall under Mannat's planning criteria.

The next set of criteria that fall under technical skills are: motivating students, knowledge of subject matter, assessing prior knowledge and using observation forms. This is followed by Instructional skills criteria of identifying nonverbal cues, communicating ideas effectively and explaining concepts. The last set of criteria fall under classroom management. They are superior personality and good judgment and reasoning.

Table 2

Responses to Student Evaluation Forms, Sorted By Competency (Please Refer To Appendices At End of Text)

	Criteria			
	Planning	Technical Skills	Instructional Skills	Classroom Management
Appendix A Catonsville CC	Q1,Q3,Q4, Q5,Q7,Q8, Q10,Q11, Q14	Q2,Q3,Q5,Q7, Q8,Q10,Q11, Q13,Q14	Q2,Q5,Q6,Q8,Q9, Q10,Q11	Q3,Q4,Q5,Q6, Q9,Q11,Q13
Appendix B J.Sargeant Reynolds	Q11,Q13, Q15,Q22 Q24.Q25	Q17,Q21	Q1,Q2,Q3,Q4,Q5, Q6,Q7,Q8,Q9,Q12	Q10,Q14,Q16, Q19
Appendix C Dabney S. Lancaster	Q3,Q4,Q5, Q7,Q10	Q2	Q1,Q6,Q11	Q9
Appendix D Montgomery CC	Q1,Q3,Q4, Q5,Q6,Q7, Q8,Q9,Q10Q11,Q14, Q15,Q16, Q19,Q21	Q1,Q2,Q7,Q8, Q9,Q10,Q11, Q12,Q13,Q15, Q17,Q18,Q19, Q20	Q1,Q2,Q3,Q4,Q5, Q6,Q8,Q9,Q17,Q18,Q20	Q6,Q10,Q12, Q13Q15,Q16, Q17,Q19,Q20
Appendix E Baltimore City CC	Q3	Q2	Q1,Q5	
Appendix F Chesapeake CC	Q3,Q5,Q6, Q9	Q1,Q5,Q8	Q3,Q6	
Appendix G Averett CC	Q1.1,Q1.2, Q1.4,Q1.5, Q1.6,Q1.7, Q1.8,Q1.9	Q1.1,Q1.3,Q1.9 Q2.2,	Q1.1,Q1.4,Q1.5,Q1.6, Q2.1,Q2.3	Q1.1,Q1.2,Q1.3, Q1.7
Appendix H Northern Virginia CCI	Q1,Q2,Q7, Q13	Q3,Q14	Q4,Q9,Q10	Q5,Q8,Q12

The responses to student evaluation forms show consistency in terms of the outcome of the coding. The coding scheme is appropriate to the analysis intended in this study. The coding scheme results are that Appendix A has an even distribution of questions related to competencies of teaching effectiveness. Appendix B has fewer technical skills, but an even distribution of planning and instructional skills. Appendix C has fewer technical and classroom management skills, but has planning and instructional skills. Appendix D has an even distribution of competencies. Appendix E lacks classroom management skills, but has planning, technical and instructional skills. Appendix F lacks classroom management skills, too, but has planning and technical skills. Appendix G has an even distribution of competencies, as does Appendix H.

Definitions of code categories Have therefore been refined. The end product of the coding process is the conversion of data items into attribute composing variables which, in this study, are competencies of instruction.

Instrumentation, which is applied in this research study, can be a technique to facilitate learning via the gathering of data in a systematic or structured way. The learning may relate to individuals, groups or the total organizations of community colleges.

It is necessary for instructors to understand that instruments are useful for generating data that individuals, groups, and the total organization can examine to augment instructional effectiveness. In a classroom situation, instruments are tools for introspection and discussion. Instruments may be used at various stages in the teaching environments in community colleges—as pre-work, as ice breakers, as openers, in mid-session, to close, or as a back-home continuation. To construct or analyze an instrument, one should collect data, as is the case with this study. A format and criteria on the subject, and a scoring system (which, in this case, is Mannat's criteria or instructional techniques and prioritizing those items, checking the instrument with colleagues for logic, readability, and in this study, instructional effectiveness techniques).

Instruments may also be developed by participants. Developing or analyzing the instruments is fun and gives the devices read acceptance by participants. Even when the researchers have arrived at observation-measurement procedures that seem adequately valid and reliable, there is always the problem of having too much to observe and measure. The method of sampling by using student questionnaires from eight community colleges is useful because it keeps the study on track, and does not divert attention from the goal of the study.

Table 3

	Catonsville Community College Student Evaluation	
	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for Catonsville Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
1.	The instructor clearly explains the course objectives and requirements	**Planning:** Means-Referenced Objectives
2.	The instructor clearly explains grading practices	**Technical Skills:** Using Observation Forms
3.	The instructor's grading is fair	**Technical Skills; Classroom Management:** Good Judgement and Reasoning
4.	The instructor's class-room activities are well planned and organized	**Planning:** Organization, Assessing Learning Outcomes, Preparation; **Classroom Management**
5.	The instructor's lectures and/or presentations are clear and informative	**Planning:** Organization, Preparation, **Technical Skills:** Knowledge of Subject Matter; **Classroom Management**
6.	The instructor is open to questions and differing opinions	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively, Explaining Concepts; **Classroom Management:** Superior Personality
7.	The instructor's tests and assignments are graded and returned in a reasonable time	**Planning:** Organization, Assessing Learning Outcomes; **Technical Skills:** Motivating Students,
8.	The instructor's textbooks and handouts are helpful for learning	**Technical Skills:** Using Observation Forms; **Instructional Skills:** Identifying Non Verbal Cues
9.	The instructor's assignments are reasonable and worth while	**Instructional Skills; Classroom Management:** Good Judgement and Reasoning
10.	The instructor makes helpful comments on assignments, papers, and examinations	**Planning:** Assessing Learning Outcomes; **Technical Skills:** Motivating Students, Communicating Ideas Effectively
11.	The instructor is on time in meeting classes and in keeping Appointments	**Planning:** Preparation; **Technical Skills; Classroom Management:** Superior Personality,
12.	The instructor is avail-able for out-of-class conferences	No criteria

	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for Catonsville Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
13.	The instructor cares about the student's progress	**Technical Skills:** Motivating Students; **Classroom Management:** Superior Personality
14.	The instructor seems to know the subject matter	**Planning:** Preparation, Knowledge of Subject Matter

Table 4

	J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College Student Evaluation	
	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
1.	My instructor has made learning interesting	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
2.	My instructor held the class's attention	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
3.	My instructor answered questions in a helpful manner	**Instructional Skills:** Explaining Concepts
4.	My instructor was willing to give me help when I needed it	**Planning:** Preparation
5.	My instructor respected individuals	**Instructional Skills:** Identifying Nonverbal Cues
6.	My instructor encouraged class discussion	**Instructional Skills**
7.	My instructor displayed a clear understanding of course topics	**Instructional Skills:** Explaining Concepts
8.	My instructor spoke audibly and clearly	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
9.	My instructor explained information clearly and understandably	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
10.	The instructor used class time appropriately	**Classroom Management:** Good Judgement and Reasoning
11.	Class presentations were well organized	**Planning:** Organization
12.	There was an appropriate mixture of lecture and discussion	**Instructional Skills**
13.	I understood what was expected of me in this course	**Planning:** Learning Outcomes
14.	The activities of this course were relevant to achieving the goals	**Classroom Management**
15.	Tests in this course were fair.	**Planning:** Learning Outcomes
16.	Tests in this course were related to the course content	**Classroom Management:** Good Judgement and Reasoning.
17.	Assignments were related to the goals of this course	**Technical Skills**
18.	Directions for course assignments were clear and specific	No criteria
19.	The grading system was explained to the class	**Classroom Management**

	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
20.	The grading system was fair.	No criteria
21.	Teaching methods used in this course were well chosen	**Technical Skills:** Knowledge of Subject Matter
22.	The format of this course was appropriate to the purposes of this course	**Planning:** Means-Referenced Objectives
23.	Lecture information was adequately supplemented by other work	No Criteria
24.	The instructor organized this course well	**Planning:** Organization
25.	The course syllabus/outline presented a clear outline of course topics	**Planning:** Learning Outcomes

Table 5

Dabney S. Lancaster Community College Student Evaluation		
	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for Dabney S. Lancaster Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
1.	Does the instructor display enthusiasm about the subject, keeping in mind that everyone has an off day?	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
`2.	Does the instructor encourage student involvement and initiative?	**Technical Skills:** Motivating Students
3.	Is the instructor available to work with students outside the class?	**Planning**
4.	Is the instructor punctual in grading and returning tests and assignments?	**Planning:** Preparation
5.	Is the instructor punctual in beginning and dismissing class?	**Planning:** Identifying Set and Closure
6.	Does the instructor seem to care whether the students learn the material?	**Instructional Skills**
7.	(a) Do you understand the course objectives, as stated in the course outline? (b) Are the stated objectives carried out throughout the course?	(a) **Planning:** Means-Referenced Objectives (b) **Planning:** Means-Referenced Objectives
8.	Are tests and/or evaluation tools related to material covered and/or assigned?	No criteria
9.	Are the grading procedures and standards clearly explained and consistently applied?	**Classroom Management**
10.	Are the assignments fair and just in relation to accomplishing the course objectives?	**Planning**
11.	(a) Are class presentations well prepared and coherent from day to day? (b) Are class presentations interesting?	(a) **Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively (b) **Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively

Table 6

Montgomery Community College Student Evaluation		
	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for Montgomery Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
1.	The instructor explains the course material clearly	**Instructional Skills**
2.	The instructor uses good examples to illustrate the course content	**Technical Skills:** Knowledge of Subject Matter
3.	The instructor presents the material in an organized manner	**Planning:** Organization; **Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
4.	The instructor provides a useful course syllabus	**Planning:** Organization Preparation; **Instructional Skills**
5.	The instructor's syllabus makes course objectives clear	**Instructional Skills:** Explaining Concepts
6.	The instructor covers course objectives	**Planning:** Means-Referenced Objectives
7.	The instructor's tests cover the material taught	**Planning:** Assessing Learning Outcomes; **Technical Skills:** Knowledge of Subject Matter, Using Observation Forms
8.	The instructor requires reading	**Planning:** Assessing Learning Outcomes; **Technical Skills:** Using Observation Forms; **Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively,
9.	The instructor requires writing	**Planning:** Assessing Learning Outcomes; **Technical Skills:** Using Observation Forms; **Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
10.	The instructor encourages students to be prepared	**Technical Skills:** Motivating Students
11.	The instructor is prepared	**Planning:** Identifying Basic Teaching Behaviors of Set and Closure
12.	The instructor encourages students to participate and ask questions	**Planning:** Assessing Learning Outcomes
13.	The instructor treats students with respect	**Classroom Management:** Superior Personality
14.	The instructor returns students' work promptly	**Planning:** Organization, Assessing Learning Outcomes

	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for Montgomery Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
15.	The instructor makes useful comments about students work	**Planning:** Assessing Learning Outcomes; **Classroom Management:** Good Judgement and Reasoning
16.	The instructor uses instruction/class time well	**Planning:** Identifying Basic Teaching Behaviors of Set and Closure; **Classroom Management**
17.	The instructor shows concern for students	Classroom Management Superior Personality
18.	The instructor encourages students to think	**Technical Skills:** Motivating students, Knowledge of Subject matter; **Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
19.	The instructor is available to students outside of class	**Technical Skills:** Motivating Students; **Classroom Management:** Superior Personality
20.	I understand why I received the grades that I did	**Instructional Skills:** Identifying Non-verbal Cues; **Classroom Management:** Good Judgement and Reasoning
21.	The instructor meets the class the proper length of time	**Planning:** Identifying Basic Teaching Behaviors of Set and Closure

Table 7

Baltimore City Community College Student Evaluation		
	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for Baltimore City Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
1.	What are the strengths of this instructor?	**Instructional Skills**
2.	Comment on the content of the course (Is it interesting, difficult, irrelevant, challenging, etc.)	**Technical Skills:** Knowledge of Subject Matter
3.	Which classroom activities most helped you to learn the required course material? Which, if any, detracted from your ability to learn the required material?	**Planning:** Preparation
4.	Give a general evaluation of the textbook(s) and other instructional materials used in the course	No Criteria
5.	Based on your experience in this course, would you recommend this instructor to a friend or another student?	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
6.	This course is: A major course, A required but not a major course, An elective	No Criteria

Table 8

Chesapeake Community College Student Evaluation		
	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for Chesapeake Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
1.	How clear were course objectives and requirements in the syllabus?	**Instructional Skills**
2.	How clearly was the course organized and presented to help students achieve the learning objectives?	**Classroom Management**
3.	How would you evaluate the required materials (books, articles, videotapes, etc.) for the course in terms of the learning objectives?	**Planning**
4.	How clear was the grading system used in the course?	No Criteria
5.	How helpful were comments on tests, papers, or other assignments?	**Planning, Classroom Management**
6.	Were the graded materials returned promptly enough to be useful in your learning in this course?	**Planning**
7.	How effective was the teacher in encouraging student participation?	**Instructional Skills**
8.	How helpful was the teacher when students did not understand the material?	**Classroom Management**
9.	To what extent was the teacher reasonably available for help outside the classroom?	**Planning**
10.	What do you think were some of the strengths of this course?	**Communicating Ideas Effectively**
11.	Explain your overall rating of this course and indicate your rating below.	No Criteria

Table 9

Averett Community College Student Evaluation		
	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for Averett Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
1.	I. Instruction The instructor's education and practical experience were appropriate to teach this course	**Technical Skills:** Knowledge of Subject Matter
2.	The instructor made good use of class time	**Planning:** Organization
3.	The instructor was effective in helping students exchange knowledge with each other (horizontal learning)	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
4.	The instructor taught all of the learning objectives set out in the curriculum	**Planning:** Means-Referenced Objectives
5.	The instructor made it clear why the subject matter was important	**Technical Skills:** Knowledge of Subject Matter
6.	The instructor established clear criteria for evaluating students' performance	**Instructional Skills:** Explaining Concepts
7.	The instructor's grades were an accurate reflection of students' performance	No Criteria
8.	The instructor provided detailed feedback on students' performance	**Technical Skills:** Using Observation Forms
9.	The instructor set high standards for learning in this course	**Planning:** Assessing Learning Outcomes
	II. Curriculum	
1.	The curriculum learning objectives were clearly defined	**Planning:** Means-Referenced Objectives
2.	The learning objectives focused on knowledge that can be applied in the workplace	**Planning:** Means-Referenced Objectives
3.	The learning objectives provided balanced attention to theory and practice	**Planning:** Means-Referenced Objectives

	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for Averett Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
4.	The textbook and supporting materials were helpful in achieving the learning objectives	No Criteria
5.	Study groups/cooperative activities enhanced my learning in this course	**Classroom Management:** Good Judgement and Reasoning
	III. Learning Outcomes and Impact	
1.	Prior to this course, I knew little or nothing about this subject	**Planning:** Assessing Learning Outcomes
2.	Having completed this course, I have a good theoretical understanding of this subject	**Technical Skills:** Knowledge of Subject Matter
3.	Having completed this course, I can apply what I have learned directly to the work environment	**Planning**
4.	I anticipate long term benefits associated with what I have learned in this course	**Planning:** Assessing Learning Outcomes
5.	Estimate your improvement in the following skills as a result of taking this course:	No criteria
	a. Written Communications and Presentation Skills	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
	b. Oral Communications and Presentation Skills	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
	c. Group Process and Teamwork Skills	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
	d. Information Literacy Skills	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
	e. Quantitative Skills	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
	f. Critical Thinking and Decision-Making Skills	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively

	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for Averett Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
	IV. Academic Support Services	
	1. On average, how long did each class meet?	No Criteria
	2. Textbooks and curriculum materials were available when you needed them	No Criteria
	3. Equipment and physical facilities were satisfactory	No Criteria
	4. Administrative support services met your needs	No Criteria
	5. Library services met your needs	No Criteria

Table 10

Northern Virginia Community College		
	These questions appear on the student evaluation form for Northern Virginia Community College	*This question matches the following criteria*
1.	The course syllabus provides clearly defined objectives	**Planning:** Means-Referenced Objectives
2.	The instructor presents material in an organized way	**Planning:** Organization
3.	The instructor makes subject matter meaningful and clear through examples and applications	**Technical Skills:** Knowledge of Subject Matter
4.	The instructor conveys his or her knowledge of the subject with enthusiasm	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
5.	The instructor's evaluative instruments (tests, quizzes, etc.) accurately evaluate student's knowledge of the subject matter	**Classroom Management:** Good Judgement and Reasoning
6.	The instructor grades student work fairly	No Criteria
7.	The instructor meets classes on time	**Planning:** Preparation
8.	The instructor uses class time constructively	**Classroom Management:** Good Judgement and Reasoning
9.	The instructor maintains an appropriate learning environment	**Instructional Skills:** Communicating Ideas Effectively
10.	The instructor responds helpfully to student comments and questions	**Instructional Skills:** Explaining Concepts
11.	The instructor is available to students outside of class	No Criteria
12.	The instructor shows interest in students' progress	**Classroom Management:** Good Judgement and Reasoning
13.	What did you like most about the course? Why?	**Planning:** Means-referenced Objectives
14.	List any suggestions you have that would improve the course	**Technical Skills:** Assessing Prior Knowledge
15.	Further comments	

Discussion

The results of analysis made showed that some of the questions are related to one or more of the criteria, that most of the questions are valid and reliable, in terms of measuring teaching effectiveness, and that some questions are more related to teaching effectiveness than others. Finally, descriptive studies of class room teaching in community colleges and expert opinion have been used to develop data on teacher effectiveness as it occurs in typical class rooms.

This research project on evaluating teaching effectiveness in the community college contains evidence that the emphasis and use of definitions of instructional goals, including specification of criterion measures, is accompanied by more favorable assessment of teachers. Student evaluations, in spite of limitations and faults, can be quite helpful. Improvisations can also take place; for example, the students' verbal discussion of the good and bad aspects of teaching in the last class period, or a written critique.

Another finding for this study is that no single data source is sufficiently reliable, works for all practitioners, addresses all that a teacher does, will be supported by all teachers, and will be agreed to by all educators. It is, however, critical that as much objectivity as possible must be included in evaluations in order to improve college teaching.

Students, as the ultimate consumers of the teachers' efforts, know best whether a teacher has been effective or not to them. Yet others argue that while not trained judges of the suitability of their mentor's methods, students do judge whether or not the course had value for them. Although their reactions are not the only index of teacher competence, students appear to be most sharply focused on teaching itself, both its content and process.

Given the importance or oral communication, it is incumbent on the community college education system in the United States to develop and implement the best curriculum and pedagogical methods for ensuring that all students achieve communication competence. It is important to monitor and understand the dynamics of education and evaluation and the status of oral communication. The present study is part of that monitoring effort.

The process of measurement involved studying student evaluation forms that are used in eight community colleges. The methodology used was content analysis. The variables measured were the criteria established by Mannat and how those variables related to the questions on evaluation forms.

Creating measurements has the advantage of greater possible relevance and validity. Measures with a long history of use usually have known degrees of validity and reliability. Measurement is something to be taken very seriously in evaluation. Determining all the variables that should be measured and getting appropriate measurements can be difficult.

While content analysis is often used in the study of communication processes, it is also appropriate for a study of this nature. The content analyst has sampled words, sentences, paragraphs or similar units of communication. There has been coding of the primary observation and recording process.

Nearly everyone would agree that the goal of evaluation would be the determination of the effectiveness of a program. But this has little meaning until educators answer the question, "In terms of what?" Evaluators know that evaluation is needed in order to improve future programs and to eliminate those programs, which are ineffective.

With this clarification of the meaning of evaluation, educators in community colleges can pinpoint their efforts at evaluation. The conclusion about learning is that it is much more difficult to measure learning than it is to measure reaction.

If instructors can prove that their programs have been effective in terms of learning, as well as in terms of reaction, they have objective data to use in promoting community college teaching. Educators may be negatively affected by the rationale that because it is difficult to measure the output of education--much less measure it accurately—there is no need for the evaluation process.

A combination of things makes evaluation a key element of teaching. Instructors in community colleges must see the direct relationship between teaching behaviors and performance. According to Arnold and McClure (1989, p. 14), "Computer technology allows for sophisticated and usable statistical analysis to serve as a tool for the instructor." Because the evaluation procedure is crucial both in terms of its implications and programs which the instructor must identify while designing the instruction. The evaluation process can help show educators in community colleges what they want to know about the contribution teaching makes to the organization.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusion

In the context of the Research Questions, the nature of faculty evaluations is that they improve teaching performance when measured against criteria. The nature of the student forms used to evaluate teaching effectiveness is that most community colleges measure something important in learning environments. The extent to which teacher evaluation questions are used shows that they are based on the purposes of instruction.

In looking at all the questions and evaluations from a sample of community colleges in Virginia and Maryland, it has been demonstrated that almost all institutions in this study have more strengths than weaknesses in the forms used to evaluate teaching effectiveness in the classroom.

A content analysis of studies of teacher effectiveness in community colleges has provided some insight into this problem area. Emerging factors relating to these studies from the literature review include:

1. Teacher effectiveness has been studied from both theoretical and practical factors.

2. The teacher is the key to learning for many community college students, although some students can learn even with ineffective teachers.
3. High interest in students' subject area and a superior personality are associated with successful teaching.
4. Several factors generally differentiate effective teachers from ineffective teachers: Planning, technical skills, instructional skills, and classroom management.

The present study would appear to suggest that teacher education in community colleges has not been negligent in emphasizing to a sufficient extent what teachers indicated to be the most needed classroom competencies. This study shows that five of the eight evaluation forms measure teaching effectiveness in community colleges. Appendices A (Catonsville Community College), B (J. Sergeant Reynolds Community College), D (Montgomery Community College), H (Northern Virginia Community College), and G (Averett Community College) measure all of the criteria, while Appendices C (Dabney S. Lancaster Community College), E (Baltimore City Community College), and F (Chesapeake Community College) do not. These competencies, collected from direct reports of practicing teachers in different situations, need to be analyzed and priorities need to be established by community colleges. Each competency should be evaluated in terms of component skills and level of training necessary to develop effectiveness.

In order to offer community college teachers more realistic and optimal experiences for developing their needed on-the-job competencies in the class room, a greater proportion of teacher training programs will need to take advantage of evaluating teaching effectiveness. This strategy will force development to be less general and targeted more specifically to special problems and school populations or subgroups.

According to Martin, Myers and Mottet (1999), the instructional communication literature is rich with research that illustrates how instructor communication behaviors influence learning. It is widely documented that instructor communication behaviors influence students--for instance, in the areas of affective and cognitive learning.

What makes this study significant is that it poses the idea by Sorenson (1989) that communication behaviors used by students and how these behaviors affect the classroom climate. The study further supports Sorenson's view that student-instructor relationships are essential in community colleges because of the open door policy. Furthermore, according to Booth-Butterfield, Mosher and Mollish (1992), because students' relationships with their instructors affect instructor evaluation

(Cooper, Stewart, and Gundykunst, 1982), student-instructor interaction usually results in more favorable evaluation.

According to Christensen and Menzel (1998), students may be motivated to communicate with their instructors for reasons other than to evaluate learning. The purposes of this study were to analyze the literature and to use content analysis and criteria by Mannat that demonstrate communication behaviors in the classroom. Hopefully, the results of this study in evaluating teaching effectiveness in the classroom will provide some much needed information on how instructors are evaluated in the classroom and the outcomes of performance evaluations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

What Administrators Can Do

Community colleges that value effective teaching and that want to improve it need better ways to document what teachers do, when they do it, and the outcomes of what they do. Good documentation practices can provide more authentic evidence of good teaching, promote collegial discussion of teaching and learning, facilitate more reflective practice, and help make teaching a more valued scholarly activity (Edgerton, Lynton, and Rice, 1992).

A community college dean should develop and implement strategies, such as faculty recognition and awards, data gathering and monitoring procedures, college review processes, and faculty-tailored, individualized plans, within the college that enhance teacher motivation. The purpose of these strategies may be two-fold: (1) to redirect the effort of current and potential teachers whose energy is high, but inadequately focused on important issues and skills, and (2) to energize teachers whose dedication, compassion, and commitment are weakening (Mitchell and Peters, 1988).

Sheridan, Rice, and Seldin (1991), in a paper presented at a conference of the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), discussed effective and systematic methods and strategies that administrators can use to properly enhance the quality and effectiveness of teaching. Such strategies include (a) changing the reward systems to focus on teaching, (b) recognition of faculty for teaching, (c) mentoring of junior faculty by senior professors, and (d) encouraging participation in professional meetings.

The Role of the Dean

The role of the dean is important in evaluating teaching effectiveness in the community college faculty. The instructional dean should make sure that teacher motivation and morale are in place. It is an added responsibility of the dean to evaluate teaching effectiveness by looking at criteria to determine teaching effectiveness and evaluating how the community college faculty meet those agreed upon criteria.

Improving teacher motivation and morale is a key factor in enhancing effectiveness. The dean should establish strategies and policies that will encourage and motivate teachers to participate in collaborative teaching efforts designed to improve the quality of instruction in the classroom. The collaborative teaching efforts include working together from the top of the organization to seek everyone's commitment. Collaboration is based on the assumption that it is possible to meet instructors' needs and those of educators. The benefits of collaboration are clear: not only can issues be resolved, but there is improved relationship between the parties. Increasing teaching responsibilities, reducing workloads, setting high and objective standards, and encouraging groups are ways to motivate teachers.

A meta-analysis of university level and adult learning courses found that the use of collaborative learning concepts promoted higher achievement, high-level reasoning, more frequent generation of ideas and solutions, and greater transfer of learning than did individualistic or competitive learning strategies (Johnson, *et al.*, 1991).

A college-wide evaluation program or instrument that recognizes and supports teaching as a scholarly activity must be put in place. Using student evaluations and achievement to evaluate teaching performance and effectiveness is not necessarily sufficient. Peer reviews, collegial discussions, individual assessment, and development of evidence that new teaching strategies are used may be other sources of evaluation that should be considered.

In order to provide effective instructional leadership in the college, the dean must be an exemplary teacher to members of the faculty. According to Sheridan *et al.* (1991), "Such an assignment will be an indicator to other members of the faculty that the dean views teaching as an important item on his or her overall agenda," (p. 22).

To support and enhance teaching, the community college dean has to perform the following tasks:

1. Appoint a committee on teaching excellence. Members of such a committee would work in concert with the dean to establish standards for effective teaching, and identify goals and objectives. The committee would also develop evaluation instruments to measure faculty performance and effectiveness.
2. Develop and promote a constructive mentorship program in the college or school. Bolton (1980) discussed the importance of mentorship programs in the career development of women and found a positive relationship between achievement and participation in the programs. The development of strong collegial

3. relationships between teachers through sharing ideas and information becomes a key contribution toward improving teaching performance.
4. Encourage participation in faculty development seminars and workshop projects that deal with improving teaching.
5. Plan faculty retreats and journal clubs to focus on different classroom problems, teaching strategies, and other issues that relate to teaching and to the improvement of instruction.

Responsibility for the effort to enhance teaching effectiveness lies at the door of the college dean, who must provide the leadership for and commitment to improving teaching by ensuring that the college missions, goals, and policies are completely carried out. Effective teaching begins with effective recruitment and retention strategies. According to Nicklos and Brown (1989), "The dean should seek to improve the quality of teaching by hiring teachers who exhibit good professional skills and who have good class room experiences" (p. 66).

The Role of the Departmental Chair

The administrative role and leadership of the department chair or coordinator are essential to improving the instructional effectiveness of the faculty. Clearly, the chair is the instructional leader of the department. As the instructional leader, that person must establish a collective departmental focus or vision toward improvement of instruction.

improving teaching effectiveness must be a collective effort of the faculty and the chair, one in which the chair, of course, plays the central role. The key question is, *How can the chair create a climate that nurtures and supports instructional effectiveness?* As an administrator, the chair must create a positive interpersonal work environment within the department by performing the following tasks. The study suggests that discussions with the faculty on evaluation need to occur before a group and administration. In other words, everyone who is involved in education should have an agreed-upon agenda that teaching is important. Even though the idea of evaluation may hamper trust, if it is done constructively, it will improve the program. The specifics are articulated by Bloom (1971, p.7):

1. Establishing an open atmosphere that encourages faculty trust
2. Listening to faculty needs, personal issues, and interests
3. Working jointly or collaboratively with faculty to set departmental goals
4. Establishing evaluation models, processes, and procedures for collecting data that measure teaching performance
5. Monitoring faculty progress and providing feedback
6. Refocusing faculty efforts toward teaching through departmental activities that showcase quality teaching

7. Developing on effective teaching that consider the four dimensions of teaching: skills, instructional strategies, philosophy, and attitudes toward students and toward one's self.

This study suggests that discussions with the faculty on evaluation need to occur both as a group and individually. These specifics are articulated by Bloom.

Community college administrators and faculty should look at criteria in this study in order to use or design an evaluation form to measure student learning because this study clearly looks at the effectiveness of the teacher and it identifies some key competencies related to the way students in community colleges learn.

Limitations

Several limitations influence the study of evaluating teaching effectiveness in community colleges in important ways. First is the fact that there has been very little research done on this topic at the community college level, a problem which could not be overcome in this study.

Second, teaching in various learning environments makes it impossible to assess effectively what would work in a specific community college. The researcher is aware of these difficulties, having taught at four different institutions, but circumstances do not allow them to be overcome without creating greater limitations, such as teacher attitude and expectation and the outcome of learning.

This study shows that the instrument designed for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness can also be used to evaluate units of instruction, since the same factor structure holds for teaching units as for teaching effectiveness. This fact should prove a convenience in future research, allowing investigators to compare teaching effectiveness units with one another or with the overall evaluation of the course. Because of the diversity of courses and units involved in the analysis reported, it is reasonable to expect the structure of the instrument to hold up across a variety of content and teaching methods.

Future Research

A combination of things makes evaluation a key element of teaching and learning. As mentioned, instructors and administrators in community colleges must see the direct relationships between teaching behaviors, performance, and the bottom line, which is student satisfaction. The instructor truly must sell this relationship to students.

Because teaching is politically weak (not highly rewarded) in some community colleges, the evaluation process can help show instructors what they want to know about the contributions teaching communication makes to the community college. Remember that the purpose of teaching is practical; that is, the results must be relevant and useful to the student, the school, and society.

As educators enter the new millennium, instructors should be acquiring skills to assist students in community colleges to develop their abilities to cope with change. Instructors should be asking such questions as, "How do we communicate change?" "How do we adapt to change using communication as the underlying process?" These questions represent the most important topic that instructors in the community college will have to face in the years to come. Educators have heard of how rapidly our knowledge base has increased; that phenomenon will only continue.

A number of possible courses of action present themselves as a result of this study. Additional research is recommended in order to assess the perceptions of teachers, and even students, as they consider teaching effectiveness. Such additional studies, combined with ongoing "objective" research into specific criteria related to teaching effectiveness, would provide a valuable point from which to view the complexities of the teaching process.

Changes might include adding communication components to current education courses, incorporating additional communication courses into the curriculum, and requiring assessment of communication skills throughout the program, including during student teaching. Communication and education departments might cooperate to share resources and expertise, devise courses and course components, and facilitate the development of education students as competent communicators.

In a study conducted by Laura Reardon (1994) titled "Transforming Students Into Powerful Learners," three themes directly relate to this study. They are: (a) the nature of community college students, (b) the influence of powerful learning experiences, and (c) the model of interpersonal validating.

The nature of community college students is that they are diverse, not only culturally, but in their life backgrounds and in what they expect from college. Some have high aspirations. They confront out-of-class obstacles, such as working full- or part-time or undergoing physical rehabilitation or experiencing financial difficulties. Some have low expectations, and many come from communities where higher education is not highly valued. Such students expect faculty to understand their difficulties and to help them learn. Some yearn for understanding, acceptance, and recognition; some express needs for structure and direction.

Community college students need the influence of powerful learning experiences. For some, most powerful learning experiences occurred out of college and ranged from positive to negative. For these students, powerful learning reflected the voice of experience that transcended academic learning. Examples of powerful learning experiences include learning the value of a college education from a father who dropped out of high school or from a job experience that involved lifting refrigerators. The difficulties experienced make it necessary to secure a valuable education. Students in community colleges come to their classrooms not as empty receptacles, but as individuals with a reservoir of knowledge that is often not taken into account by their classes.

The role of the interpersonal validating model proposed by Reardon (p. 23) means faculty and staff should actively reach out to students to help them get involved in college. Faculty should consider all students as important and equal. The community college should promote pride in cultural, gender, and sexual orientation through college-sponsored activities and organizations.

Counselors should meet with students to teach them stress management, decision-making techniques, and college coping skills. Students should be encouraged to help each other by providing positive reinforcement, forming friendships during orientation, living with and interacting with peers, for instance. Learning standards should be designed in collaboration with students, and students should be allowed to re-do assignments until they master them. Students should work together in teams and should be encouraged to share information. A climate of success should be fostered by faculty and students in community colleges. Learning should allow for reflection, multiple perspectives, and imperfection.

Given that higher education is likely to get more, not fewer, nontraditional students, it is important that researchers and practitioners design studies and practices with a full understanding of the issues students bring to college. Transformed students should begin to believe in their inherent capacity to learn to become excited about learning, to be motivated and driven to succeed, to feel that what they know is important and valuable, and feel cared about as people, not just as students.

References

Anderson, C. C. & Hunka, S. M. (1963). Teacher evaluation: Some problems and a proposal. Harvard Educational Review, 4.

Apple, M. W. (1988). Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education. New York: Routledge.

Arnold, E. W. & McClure, L. (1989). Communication training and development. New York: Harper and Row.

Bailey, D. H. (1967). Making college teaching a profession: Improving college and university teaching. NASSP Bulletin, 62, 59.

Banks, J. A. (1991). Teaching strategies for ethnic groups. (5th Ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennet, S. J. (1995). "HELPA": A rapid means of student evaluation of lecturing performance in higher education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Benson, D. E. & Lewis, J. M. (1994). Students evaluation of teaching and accountability. Teaching Sociology, 22, 195-199.

Benson, J. (1987). Designing evaluation studies: Sources of invalidity for experimental and quasi-experimental designs. International Journal of Educational Research, 11, 52-55.

Bloom, S. B. (1971). Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Bogdan, R. (1978). Optimistic friend: positive evaluation. *Research Educational Technology*, *18*, 39-40.

Bolton, D. L. (1973). *Selection and evaluation of teachers*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Bolton, E. B. (1980). A conceptual analysis of the mentoring relationship in the career development of women. *Adult Education*, *20*, 195-207.

Bonetti, S. (1994). On the use of student questionnaires. *Higher Education Review*, *26* (3), 57-64.

Booth-Butterfield, S., Mosher, N., & Mollish, D. (1992). Teacher immediacy and student involvement: A dual process analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, *9*, 13-21.

Borge, E. G. (1967). Student appraisal of teaching effectiveness in higher education: Summary of the literature. *Educational Quest*, *6*, 19-25.

Borich, G. D. (1986). Paradigms of teacher effectiveness research. *Education and Urban Society*, *18*, 143-167.

Brophy, J. (1973). Stability of teacher effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal*, *10*, 245-252.

Carpenter, C. & Doig, J. (1987). Assessment: Institution choice or legislative mandate? *Connexions*, *4*, 4.

Cristensen, L. J. & Menzel, K. E. (1998). The linear relationship between student reports of teacher immediacy behaviors and perceptions of student motivation and of cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning. *Communication Education*, *47*, 82-90.

Civickly, J.M. (1992). *Classroom communication principles and practice*. New York: William C. Brown.

Clark, M. (1983). Some implications of close social bonds for help-seeking. *New Directions in Helping* (Vol. 2). New York: Academic Press.

Clevenger, T., Jr., Porter, T. D., & Bradley, B.B. (1979) *A short semantic differential for course evaluation*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University Communication Research Center.

Clouder, L. (1999). Getting the "right answers": Student evaluation as a reflection of intellectual development. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *3* (2), 7-15.

Contrell, R. D. (1966). The study of education for professional purposes, in *The Body of Knowledge Unique to the Profession of Education*. Bloomington: Pi Lamda Theta.

Cooper, J. M. (1986). *Classroom teaching skills*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company

Cooper, J.P., Stewart, L.P., & Gudykunst, W.B. (1982). Relationship with instructor and other variables influencing student evaluations of instruction. *Communication Quarterly*, *30*, 308-315.

Cooper, P.J. (1991). *Speech communication for the college classroom*. (5th ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gosuch Scarisbrick.

Cronen, V. E. & Price, W. K. (1974). Classyear, dimensions of student judgement and the use of course evaluation instruments. Speech Teacher, 23, 34-39.

Dovring, K. (1954-1955). Quantitative semantics in 18th century Sweden. Public Opinion Quarterly, 18, 389-394.

Duke, D. L. (1984). Teaching: The imperiled profession. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Edgerton, R., Lynton, E., & Rice, E. (1992). The teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship in teaching. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Ehan, K. (1986). Teaching as story telling. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fisher, B. A. (1983). Differential effects of interactional context on interaction patterns in dyads. Human Communication Research, 9, 225-238.

Flesher, W. R. (1952). Inferential student rating of instructors. Educational Research Bulletin, 31, 57-62.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Giffin, K. (1967). Interpersonal trust in small group communication. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 53, 224-34.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). Schooling and the struggle for private life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Green, M. (1986). Philosophy and teaching, in M. C. Wittrock (Ed.). Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Gregory, K. J. (1991). Assessing departmental academic performance: A model for a UK university. Higher Education Review, 23 (3), 48-59.

Hall, C. & Fitzgerald, C. (1995). Student summative evaluation of teaching: Code of practice. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 20, 307-311.

Higher Education Quality Council. (1994). Learning from audit. Birmingham, AL: Author.

Hobson, E. N. (1974). Accountability: Password for the 70s. Improving College and University Teaching, 22, 84.

Hodge, V. (1996). Student learning outcomes assessment and institutional effectiveness activities at Bellevue Community College. Report of the 1996-97 Assessment Inventory. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Hodge, V. (1995). Using indicators of effectiveness to demonstrate accountability of community colleges. Speech/conference paper.

Husbands, C. T. (1997). Variations in students evaluation of teaching in higher education. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 18 (2), 95-114.

Husbands, C. T. & Fosh, P. (1993). Student evaluation of teaching in higher education: Experiences from four European countries and some implications of the practice. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 18 (2), 95-114.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1994). Structuring academic controversy, in S. Sharan (Ed.). Handbook of cooperative learning methods. (pp. 66-81). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Johnson, S. M. (1990). Teachers at Work: Achieving Success in our Schools. NY: Basic Books.

Jones, J. (1989). Students ratings of teacher personality and teaching competence. Higher Education, 18, 551-558.

Levin, B. (1979). Teacher evaluation: A review of research. Educational Leadership, 87, 3.

Manatt, R. (1982). Teacher performance evaluation: practical application of research. Occasional Paper 82-1. Ames, IA: Iowa State University.

Martin, M., Meyers, S., & Mottet, P. (1999). Communication Education, 48/2, 155.

McCroskey, J. C. (1985). Power in the classroom V: Behavior alteration techniques, communication training and learning. Communication Education, 34, 214-226.

McCroskey, J. C., Holdridge, W., & Toomb, J. K. (1974) An instrument for measuring the source credibility of basic speech communication instructors. Speech Teacher, 23, 26-33.

McCroskey, J. C. & Richmond, V. P. (1992). Power in the classroom: teacher and student perceptions. Communication Education, 32, 176-184.

McGlore, E. L. & Anderson, L. J. (1973) The dimensions of teacher credibility. Speech Teacher, 22, 196-200.

McGreal, T. (1980). Helping teachers set goals. Educational Leadership, 37, 414-420.

McKeachie, W. J., ed. (1968). Research on characteristics of effective teaching. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. Retrieved from ERIC database (ERIC Reproduction Service, Document Ed. 024, 347.)

McKeachie, W. J. (1976). Psychology in America's bicentennial year. American Psychologist, 31, 818-833.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1982). A preliminary investigation of teacher evaluation practices. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation.

Meeth, L. R. (1976). The stateless art of teaching evaluation. Change Magazine, 3-5.

Miller, D. K. (1986, October). The effective teacher. Physical Educator, 35, 147-148.

Mitchell, E. & Peters, M. (1988). A stronger profession through appropriate teacher incentives. Educational Leadership, 21, 18-25.

Murray, H. G. (1994). The impact of formative and summative evaluation of teaching in North American universities. Assessment And Evaluation in Higher Education, 2, 117-132.

Natriello, G. & Wilson, B. (1980). Pitfalls in the evaluation of teachers. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nicklos, L. & Brown, W. S. (1989). Recruiting minorities Into the teaching profession: An educational imperative. Educational Horizons, 67, 145-149.

Nwagwu, Emmanuel C. (1998). How community college administrators can improve teaching effectiveness. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 31, 12-18.

Pascarella, E. (1997, February). It's time we started paying attention to community college students. Information Analysis, 18.

Perry, W. G. (1988). Different worlds in the same classroom, in P. Ramsden (Ed.). Improving learning: New perspectives. London: Kogan Page.

Peterson, K. (1984). Methodological problems in teacher evaluation. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 17 (4), 62-70.

Popham, W. J. (1981). Teacher evaluation: The wrong tests for the right job. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Los Angeles, CA: Josey-Bass.

Raths, J. (1982). Research Synthesis on summative evaluation of teacher. Educational Leadership, 39, 310-313.

Ravitch, D. (1984). A good school. American Scholar, 53, 480-493.

Reardon, L. (1994). Transforming students into powerful learners.

Rosenfeld, L. R. (1983) Communication climate and coping mechanisms in the college classroom. Communication Education, 32, 167-174.

Rosenfeld, L. R. & Jarrard, M. W. (1985). The effects of perceived sexism in female and male college professors on students descriptions of classroom climate. Communication Education, 34, 205-213.

Rosenshine, B. (1971). Teacher behavior related to pupil achievement: A review of research. In R. Travers (Ed.). Research on teaching (pp. 36-43). New York: Teacher College Press.

Ross, L. (1977). Intuitive Psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process in L. Berkowitz (Ed.). Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, vol. 10 (pp. 49-54). New York: Academic Press.

Schutz, William C. (1958). FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Schoon, D. A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scriven, M. (1981) Summative teacher evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.). Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Sharpe, S. (1995). The quality of teaching and learning in higher education: Evaluating the evidence. Higher Education Quarterly, 49, 301-315.

Sheridan, H., Rice, E., & Seldin, P. Paper presented at the National Conference on Higher Education. Washington, DC.

Silver, H. (1992). Student feedback: Issues and experience. London: Council for National Academic Awards.

Sinclair, C. (1994). Students and lecturers--Are we so different? Educational Change And Development, 14 (2), 41-46.

Slark, J. (1997). 12 measures of success. Santa Ana, CA: Rancho Santiago Community College Office of Research, Planning and Resource Development.

Sorensen, G. (1989). The relationships among teachers' self-disclosure statements, students' perceptions, and affective learning. Communication Education, 38, 259-276.

Spencer, R. E. & Aiemoni, L. M. (1970). A student course evaluation questionnaire. Journal of Educational Measurement, 19.

Stallings, J. A. & Stipek, D. (1986). Research on early childhood and elementary school training programs in M. C. Wittrock (Ed.). Handbook of research on teaching, (3rd ed.) New York: MacMillan.

Stone, P. J., Dunphy, D. C., Smith, M. S. & Ogilvie, D. M. (1966). A computer approach to content analysis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Thompson, M. O. (1990, March). Evaluating adjunct faculty in an English program. Paper presented at the College Composition and Communication Conference. Chicago.

Travers, R. M. W. (1997). Criteria for good teaching in J. Millman (Ed.). Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Tuckman, B. W. (1974) Teaching: The application of psychological constructs, in R. T. Hyman (Ed.). Teaching: Vantage points for study, (2nd ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Utley, A. (1997, April 18). Teaching in decline says study. Times Higher Educational Supplement. p. 6.

Wagoner, R. L. & O'Hanlon, J. P. (1968). Teacher attitudes toward evaluation. Journal of Teacher Education, 19, 471-475.

Weick, K. E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 63.

Wellsfry, N. (1995). Accountability in community colleges: Balancing the perception with reality. Columbus, OH: National Council For Occupational Education.

Wilson, J. (1974). Socio-psychological accessibility and faculty student interaction beyond the classroom. Sociology of Education, 47, 74-92.

Wood, B. (1977). Development of functional communication skills. Urbana, IL: Eric and Speech Assocation.

Wynne, E. (1981). Looking at good schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 377-381.

Yates, J. (1994). The maturity and the development of personal skills and qualities. Journal of Further And Higher Education, 18 (3), 109-118.

Zeichner, K. M. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34, 3-9.

Appendix A

Catonsville Community College

Student Evaluation

(following page)

CATONSVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

STUDENT EVALUATION SURVEY

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

DESCRIPTION			
SEMESTER		CREDIT	
DAYS		ROOM	

Meaning of response choices:
1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Disagree
4 = Strongly Disagree
5 = Not Applicable

Use only a No. 2 pencil and erase completely to change responses.
Fill in the course number and section on appropriate lines above.
Sign your name in the appropriate place on the answer sheet. (Unsigned survey forms will not be counted.)

For each of the following questions, choose the response closest to your opinion and blacken the appropriate box.

1.	The instructor clearly explains the course objectives and requirements.	1.	●②③④⑤
2.	The instructor clearly explains grading practices.	2.	①②③④⑤
3.	The instructor's grading is fair.	3.	①②③④⑤
4.	The instructor's classroom activities are well planned and organized.	4.	①②③④⑤
5.	The instructor's lectures and/or presentations are clear and informative.	5.	①②③④⑤
6.	The instructor is open to questions and differing opinions.	6.	①②③④⑤
7.	The instructor's tests and assignments are graded and returned in a reasonable time.	7.	①②③④⑤
8.	The instructor's textbooks and handouts are helpful for learning.	8.	①②③④⑤
9.	The instructor's assignments are reasonable and worthwhile.	9.	①②③④⑤
10.	The instructor makes helpful comments on assignments, papers, and examinations.	10.	①②③④⑤
11.	The instructor is on time in meeting classes and in keeping appointments.	11.	①②③④⑤
12.	The instructor is available for out-of-class conferences.	12.	①②③④⑤
13.	The instructor cares about the student's progress.	13.	①②③④⑤
14.	The instructor seems to know the subject matter.	14.	①②③④⑤
15.		15.	①②③④⑤
16.		16.	①②③④⑤
17.		17.	①②③④⑤
18.		18.	①②③④⑤
19.		19.	①②③④⑤
20.		20.	①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤
			①②③④⑤

Student Signature ____________________

SCANTRON FORM NO. F-5039-CCC Scantron asks that you please RECYCLE this product. © SCANTRON CORPORATION 1993 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED MI-2393-C E3515-12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Appendix B

J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College

Student Evaluation

(following page)

REYNOLDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY

- Example: ⊏0⊐ ▬ ⊏2⊐ ⊏3⊐
- Erase Completely to Change

5 - Excellent
4 - Very Good
3 - Good
2 - Fair
1 - Unsatisfactory

Course Prefix & #: ____________ Sec. #: ____________ Date: __/__/__

Course Name: ____________ Instructor: ____________

⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐
⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐
⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐
⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐
⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐
⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐
⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐
⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐
⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐
⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐
⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐
⊏0⊐	⊏1⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏5⊐	⊏6⊐	⊏7⊐	⊏8⊐	⊏9⊐

CUSTOMIZED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENT EVALUATION

1. My instructor holds the class's attention.
2. My instructor stimulates interest in the course.
3. My instructor is willing to give me help when I need it.
4. This instructor gave me suggestions on ways I can improve my study.
5. My instructor encourages class discussion.
6. My instructor creates a classroom climate that is conducive to learning.
7. My instructor speaks audibly and clearly.
8. My instructor generally seems well prepared for class.
9. The instructor uses class time appropriately.
10. Class presentations were well organized.
11. The instructor presented alternative points of view when appropriate.
12. The instructor was able to demonstrate required skills.
13. My instructor provided clearly stated objectives.
14. I knew what was expected of men in this course.
15. Tests in this course were related to stated objectives.
16. Tests in this course were fair.
17. Tests in this course were related to the course content.
18. Tests stress the important points of the text.
19. The grading system was explained to the class.
20. My grades are assigned fairly and accurately.
21. The instructor made appropriate use of handouts.
22. Field trips contributed to the value of this course.
23. Audiovisual materials were used effectively in this course.
24. The instructor generally followed the course syllabus/outline.
25. The course syllabus/outline presented a clear outline of course topics.

(spa20101acarsonsum99)

①	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
②	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
③	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
④	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑤	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑥	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑦	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑧	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑨	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑩	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑪	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑫	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑬	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑭	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑮	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑯	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑰	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑱	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑲	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
⑳	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉑	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉒	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉓	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉔	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉕	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉖	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉗	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉘	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉙	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉚	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉛	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉜	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉝	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉞	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐
㉟	⊏5⊐	⊏4⊐	⊏3⊐	⊏2⊐	⊏1⊐

COMMENTS:

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

㊱ A) ⊏0⊐ ⊏1⊐ ⊏2⊐ ⊏3⊐
⊏0⊐ ⊏1⊐ ⊏2⊐ ⊏3⊐ ⊏4⊐ ⊏5⊐ ⊏6⊐ ⊏7⊐ ⊏8⊐ ⊏9⊐
B) ⊏0⊐ ⊏1⊐ ⊏2⊐ ⊏3⊐
⊏0⊐ ⊏1⊐ ⊏2⊐ ⊏3⊐ ⊏4⊐ ⊏5⊐ ⊏6⊐ ⊏7⊐ ⊏8⊐ ⊏9⊐

㊲ A) ⊏0⊐ ⊏1⊐ ⊏2⊐ ⊏3⊐
⊏0⊐ ⊏1⊐ ⊏2⊐ ⊏3⊐ ⊏4⊐ ⊏5⊐ ⊏6⊐ ⊏7⊐ ⊏8⊐ ⊏9⊐
B) ⊏0⊐ ⊏1⊐ ⊏2⊐ ⊏3⊐
⊏0⊐ ⊏1⊐ ⊏2⊐ ⊏3⊐ ⊏4⊐ ⊏5⊐ ⊏6⊐ ⊏7⊐ ⊏8⊐ ⊏9⊐

FEED THIS DIRECTION

SCANTRON CUSTOM FORM NO. 26337 - JSR - L
SCANTRON CORPORATION 1998 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
PC3 3808 252 - 5 4 3 2 TO REORDER 1-800-722-6876 WWW.SCANTRON.COM

Appendix C

Dabney Lancaster Community College

Student Evaluation

(following page)

STUDENT SURVEY OF TEACHING

The following is intended to give your instructor information which will be useful to her or him in evaluating classroom procedure. The questions can be answered or omitted at the student's option. Feel free to comment on any question.

The grading scale is as follows:		
	5-Superior	2-Below Average
	4-Above Average	1-Unsatisfactory
	3-Satisfactory	NBJ-No Basis for Judgment

1. Does the instructor display enthusiasm about the subject, keeping in mind that everyone has an "off" day? 5 4 3 2 1 NBJ
   Comment:

2. Does the instructor encourage student involvement and initiative?
   Comment: 5 4 3 2 1 NBJ

3. Is the instructor available to work with students outside the class?
   Comment: 5 4 3 2 1 NBJ

4. Is the instructor punctual in grading and returning tests and assignments?
   Comment: 5 4 3 2 1 NBJ

5. Is the instructor punctual in beginning and dismissing class?
   Comment: 5 4 3 2 1 NBJ

6. Does the instructor seem to care whether the students learn the material?
   Comment: 5 4 3 2 1 NBJ

7. (a) Do you understand the course objectives, as stated in the course outline? 5 4 3 2 1 NBJ
   Comment:

   (b) Are the stated objectives carried out throughout the course?
   Comment: 5 4 3 2 1 NBJ

8. Are tests and/or evaluation tools related to material covered and/or assigned? 5 4 3 2 1 NBJ
   Comment:

(Over)

Appendix D

Montgomery Community College

Student Evaluation

(following page)

D

MONTGOMERY COLLEGE SPEECH, DANCE, THEATRE, & AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE
FACULTY EVALUATION FORM INSTRUCTOR____________
Course:__________ Section:____________ Date:__________

The questions on this form provide an opportunity for you to think about this course and your experiences in it. Please take the time to fill it out. Your responses will be helpful to faculty in teaching and planning for the future. Thank you. Feel free to write additional comments on the back of the form.

PART I - INSTRUCTOR

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
1. The instructor explains the course material clearly.	1.					
2. The instructor uses good examples to illustrate the course content.	2.					
3. The instructor presents the material in an organized manner.	3.					
4. The instructor provides a useful course syllabus.	4.					
5. The instructor's syllabus makes course objectives clear.	5.					
6. The instructor covers course objectives.	6.					
7. The instructor's tests cover the material taught.	7.					
8. The instructor requires reading.	8.					
9. The instructor requires writing.	9.					
10. The instructor encourages students to be prepared.	10.					
11. The instructor is prepared.	11.					
12. The instructor encourages students to participate and ask questions.	12.					
13. The instructor treats students with respect.	13.					
14. The instructor returns students' work promptly.	14.					
15. The instructor makes useful comments about students' work.	15.					
16. The instructor uses instruction/class time well.	16.					
17. The instructor shows concern for students.	17.					
18. The instructor encourages students to think.	18.					
19. The instructor is available to students outside of class.	19.					
20. I understand why I received the grades that I did.	20.					
21. The instructor meets the class the proper length of time. (starts/ends class on time)	21.					

PART II - ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

		Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Not Applicable
22. The overall quality of the textbook(s) is	22.					
23. The overall quality of the tests is	23.					
24. The overall quality of the lectures is	24.					
25. The overall quality of instructor is	25.					
26.. The overall quality of the course is	26.					

Appendix E

Baltimore City Community College

Student Evaluation

(following page)

STUDENT RESPONSE SURVEY

COURSE ______________________________

INSTRUCTOR ______________________________

DAY/TIME OF COURSE ______________________________

NOTE: Student responses are intended for use by the faculty member to improve instruction, and may be used by the College Administration for personnel decisions. The completed forms will not be distributed to the faculty until after grades are submitted. Please be as frank as possible. This questionnaire deals with characteristics that you as a student should be able to identify and evaluate on the basis of your educational experience, therefore, you should feel free to express your views. Thank you for your cooperation.

CONTINUE COMMENTS ON BACK OF SHEET IF NECESSARY

1. What are the strengths of this instructor?

2. Comment on the content of the course. (Is it interesting, difficult, irrelevant,challenging, etc.)

3. Which classroom activities most helped you to learn the required course material? Which, if any, detracted from your ability to learn the required material?

4. Give a general evaluation of the textbook(s) and other instructional materials used in the course.

5. Based on your experience in this course, would you recommend this instructor to a friend or another student.
   ☐ Yes ☐ No Why?

This course is:
☐ a major course ☐ a required but not a major course ☐ an elective

Revised 5/31/95

Appendix F

Chesapeake Community College

Student Evaluation

(following page)

Appendix F Chesapeake Community College

COURSE EVALUATION

Course Number ________________ Course Name ______________________________ Semester ____________

Please evaluate your learning experience by responding to the questions below. After your written evaluation, mark the number on the point scale which most closely reflects your opinion.

I COURSE STRUCTURE AND OBJECTIVES:

1. How clear were course objectives and requirements in the syllabus? Explain:

5____ 4____ 3____ 2____ 1____
Very Good Weak

2. How clearly was the course organized and presented to help students achieve the learning objectives? Explain:

5____ 4____ 3____ 2____ 1____
Very Good Weak

3. How would you evaluate the required materials (books, articles, videotapes, etc.) for the course in terms of the learning objectives? Explain:

5____ 4____ 3____ 2____ 1____
Very Good Weak

II ASSESSMENT:

4. How clear was the grading system used in the course? Explain:

5____ 4____ 3____ 2____ 1____
Very Good Weak

5. How helpful were comments on tests, papers, or other assignments? Explain:

5____ 4____ 3____ 2____ 1____
Very Good Weak

Appendix G

Averett Community College

Student Evaluation

(following page)

Appendix G Averett Community College

Averett

An American Classic

Correct Mark	Incorrect Mark	IMPORTANT!
●	⊘ ⊗ ⊖ ⊙	USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY!

STUDENT END-OF-COURSE SURVEY

Instructions: Answer each question as precisely as you can. Mark only one response for each question. Completely erase any response you wish to change. Print your comments in the Comment Section provided.

I. INSTRUCTION

LEAVE BLANK IF A QUESTION IS NOT APPLICABLE	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mixed Evaluation	Agree	Strongly Agree
The instructor's education and practical experience were appropriate to teach this course.	①	②	③	④	⑤
The instructor made good use of class time.	①	②	③	④	⑤
The instructor was effective in helping students exchange knowledge with each other (horizontal learning).	①	②	③	④	⑤
The instructor taught all of the learning objectives set out in the curriculum.	①	②	③	④	⑤
The instructor made it clear why the subject matter was important.	①	②	③	④	⑤
The instructor established clear criteria for evaluating students' performance.	①	②	③	④	⑤
The instructor's grades were an accurate reflection of students' performance.	①	②	③	④	⑤
The instructor provided detailed feedback on students' performance.	①	②	③	④	⑤
The instructor set high standards for learning in this course.	①	②	③	④	⑤

II. CURRICULUM

LEAVE BLANK IF A QUESTION IS NOT APPLICABLE	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mixed Evaluation	Agree	Strongly Agree
The curriculum learning objectives were clearly defined.	①	②	③	④	⑤
The learning objectives focused on knowledge that can be applied in the workplace.	①	②	③	④	⑤
The learning objectives provided balanced attention to theory and practice.	①	②	③	④	⑤
The textbook and supporting materials were helpful in achieving the learning objectives.	①	②	③	④	⑤
Study groups/cooperative activities enhanced my learning in this course.	①	②	③	④	⑤

III. LEARNING OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

LEAVE BLANK IF A QUESTION IS NOT APPLICABLE	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mixed Evaluation	Agree	Strongly Agree
Prior to this course, I knew little or nothing about this subject.	①	②	③	④	⑤
Having completed this course, I have a good theoretical understanding of this subject.	①	②	③	④	⑤
Having completed this course, I can apply what I have learned directly to the work environment.	①	②	③	④	⑤
I anticipate long term benefits associated with what I have learned in this course.	①	②	③	④	⑤

[illegible]

Appendix H

Northern Virginia Community College

Student Evaluation

(following page)

⊂3⊃ ⊂5⊃

1 ⊂a⊃ ⊂b⊃ ⊂c⊃ ⊂d⊃ ⊂e⊃
2 ⊂a⊃ ⊂b⊃ ⊂c⊃ ⊂d⊃ ⊂e⊃
3 ⊂a⊃ ⊂b⊃ ⊂c⊃ ⊂d⊃ ⊂e⊃
4 ⊂a⊃ ⊂b⊃ ⊂c⊃ ⊂d⊃ ⊂e⊃
5 ⊂a⊃ ⊂b⊃ ⊂c⊃ ⊂d⊃ ⊂e⊃
6 ⊂a⊃ ⊂b⊃ ⊂c⊃ ⊂d⊃ ⊂e⊃
7 ⊂a⊃ ⊂b⊃ ⊂c⊃ ⊂d⊃ ⊂e⊃
8 ⊂a⊃ ⊂b⊃ ⊂c⊃ ⊂d⊃ ⊂e⊃
9 ⊂a⊃ ⊂b⊃ ⊂c⊃ ⊂d⊃ ⊂e⊃
10 ⊂a⊃ ⊂b⊃ ⊂c⊃ ⊂d⊃ ⊂e⊃

DO NOT MARK OR WRITE
IN SHADED AREA

STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

This evaluation indicates your reaction to and evaluation of this course and the instructor. Results will be used in making course changes, improving instruction, and evaluating faculty performance. Please fill out the form with care, using the following scale:

a - strongly agree
b - somewhat agree
c - neither agree or disagree
d - somewhat disagree
e - strongly disagree

Grade you expect to earn in this course: ___A ___B ___C ___D ___F ___X Audit

If you have no opinion or a question does not apply to your course, please leave the box blank.

1. The course syllabus provides clearly defined objectives.

2. The instructor presents material in an organized way.

3. The instructor makes subject matter meaningful and clear through examples and applications.

4. The instructor conveys his or her knowledge of the subject with enthusiasm.

5. The instructor's evaluative instruments (tests, quizzes, etc.) accurately evaluate student's knowledge of the subject matter.

6. The instructor grades student work fairly.

7. The instructor meets classes on time.

8. The instructor uses class time constructively.

9. The instructor maintains an appropriate learning environment.

10. The instructor responds helpfully to student comments and questions.

SCANTRON FORM NO. 20-S-WS

© SCANTRON CORPORATION 1972
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED (U.S. PAT. NOS. [illegible])

2 9012-CT993-12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

TO REORDER CALL 1-800-722-6876 CANADA 1-800-263-3338

OVER

INDEX

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness in Community College Setting

Author(s): Alusine M. Kanu

Corporate Source: Northern Virginia Community College	Publication Date: Spring 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
[✓ Level 1 ☑]	Level 2A ☑	Level 2B ☑
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Alusine M. Kanu DA	Printed Name/Position/Title: Assistant Professor	
Organization/Address: Northern Virginia Comm. Coll. 8333 Little River Tpke Annandale Va 22003	Telephone: 703-323-4143	FAX: 703-323-4248
	E-Mail Address: akanu@nvcc.vccs.edu	Date: May 29, 2002

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges
3051 Moore Hall, UCLA
Box 951521
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com